TEXT, TYPE, AND STYLE

A Compendium of Atlantic Usage

TEXT, TYPE AND STYLE

A COMPENDIUM OF ATLANTIC USAGE

BY

GEORGE B. IVES

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY PRESS
BOSTON

Copyright, 1921
By George B. Ives

TO MY SONS

The author takes pleasure in acknowledging his indebtedness to the Oxford University Press for permission to make extracts from Messrs. H. W. and F. G. Fowler's volume, "The King's English." He is under deep obligation also to M. A. DeWolfe Howe, Esq., and Lanius D. Evans, Esq., who have read the proofs of the book, and not only have made many invaluable suggestions, but have saved him from more than one pitfall. Miss A. M. Tankard of the Rumford Press has gone far beyond her professional duty in helping to give the book whatever value it may possess.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PROOF-READERS AND PROOF-READING 23

SPACING AND SYLLABIFICATION 41

PUNCTUATION 52

The Period 65

Ellipsis Points 68

The Colon 70

The Semicolon 78

The Comma 89

The Dash 125

The en-dash 125

The 2-em dash 125

The dash proper, or em-dash 127

The Hyphen 140

Parentheses 141

Brackets 145

The Exclamation Mark 146

The Question Mark 150

Quotation Marks 153

The Apostrophe 161

ABBREVIATIONS 163

CAPITALIZATION 168

ITALICS 179

SPELLING 186

COMPOUND WORDS 197

SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING RELATIVE PRONOUNS

I. "Who," "Which," or "That," with a Personal or Quasi-personal Antecedent 207

II. "Whom" used for "Who" 210

III. Than Whom — Than Which 211
IV. The "And Which" Construction 213
V. "That" as a Relative 216
VI. Omission of the Relative 225
VII. Whoever [Whosoever], Whomever [Whomsoever] 228

COMMON PARTS 230
Correlatives 236

NUMBER
I. Of Verbs 242
II. Of Pronouns 252

OMISSION OF WORDS
I. Verbs 255
II. Nouns 256
III. Pronouns 257
IV. The Conjunction "That" 258
V. Repetition of Conjunction "That" 262

DIVERS MATTERS
Hanging Participle 264
Nouns Used as Verbs 266
The Split Infinitive 267
Subjunctive Forms 268
The Indefinite Article, before "h" and "u" . . . 269
Adjectives and Adverbs ending in "ly" 269
Special Words and Phrases 271

CONCLUSION 297

INDEX 299

TEXT, TYPE, AND STYLE

TEXT, TYPE, AND STYLE

INTRODUCTION

THIS book is not intended as a general "handbook," or "manual of style," or as a general guide to the study of English, or as anything more than its sub-title indicates: that is to say, an effort to put into words the principles and the rules — so far as those principles can be expressed in rules — that govern the preparation of copy and the handling of proofs of the "Atlantic Monthly." It would be more accurate to say that that was the purpose of the book when first projected; for it was so long ago, that the Atlantic Monthly Press was then in its earliest infancy, and little thought had been given to the matter of the "style" to be followed in such books as it might publish. As, however, its list of publications is rapidly growing, it has become necessary to decide upon the style to be adopted in respect to those matters that are within the province of the printer or publisher rather than of the author; and the scope of this book has accordingly been broadened so far as to indicate the points — comparatively few in number — wherein the usage of the magazine differs from that of Atlantic books.

Although many printing-offices and publishers issue their own handbooks or manuals, and although there is, in addition, a large number of volumes — textbooks and others — dealing with the general subjects of typography, punctuation, grammar, syntax, rhetoric, including all the matters here discussed, this book would seem to be justified, at least, by two or three facts.

1. No such manual has been issued by the printing-office at which the "Atlantic" and many Atlantic books are printed; indeed, the character of the work done there is so varied that it would be impossible to formulate rules which would apply to more than a small part of that work. The special force assigned to work on the "Atlantic" is supposed to follow Atlantic usage, under the direction of the experienced proof-reader in charge. Other Atlantic books are printed at different offices, whose typographical usages often vary, and never agree in all points with Atlantic usage.

2. The "Atlantic" is being used, to an ever-increasing extent, in connection with regular instruction in English, in schools all over the country.

3. The "Atlantic" is frequently honored by communications, from teachers and others, calling attention to matters of punctuation, or what not, which seem to them worthy of comment; sometimes in a critical vein, sometimes merely

seeking information as to the principles by which our practice is guided.

The main difference between the magazine and Atlantic books — and the one to which nine tenths of the communications refer — is the use in the former of single quotation marks, instead of double ones, which, in accordance with the general practice in this country, are used in the books.[1] This departure from the usual American custom is fully explained in the section on "Quotation Marks." The only other difference that needs to be specially mentioned here is in the matter of division of words, where much less latitude is allowed in the books than in the magazine, as is sufficiently explained in the section on "Spacing and Syllabification." Generally speaking, the wider the type page, the easier it is to secure even spacing of the lines; and in measures of 23 or 24 picas (about four inches),[2] or more, the somewhat unusual divisions that are allowed, at need, in the narrow 14-pica columns of the "Atlantic," are forbidden. Such other differences as may exist are mentioned under the appropriate headings.

The plan of the present work is shaped by the purpose that it is intended to serve: that is to say,

[1] It should, perhaps, be said that, in the very earliest publications of the Press, which were collections of articles that had appeared in the *Atlantic*, the type was set from the pages of the magazine as copy, and the single quotation marks were not changed.

[2] The type page of this book is 20 picas wide.

it discusses, almost exclusively, such matters of typography and style, and, to some extent, of syntax, as have been brought to the author's attention in his work on the copy and proofs of the "Atlantic" during nearly seventeen years, and of Atlantic books since such things have been. The result is, necessarily, that some points are omitted which are quite as important as some that are included. There has been no attempt to make an exhaustive list of words often inaccurately used, or of questionable constructions. The conditions under which the work has been done have been such that the preparation of such a list would have meant simply drawing without stint from one or more of the general textbooks on English, or from such a work as "The King's English."

There is a vast difference between "drawing without stint" from the last-mentioned work and using it freely, as the author has done. It is an inexhaustible mine of instruction combined with entertainment; only the surface of it has been scratched by extracting the passages quoted in the following pages; and if their perusal shall lead readers to resort to this volume of the Messrs. Fowler, — authors, also, of the compact and useful little "Concise English Dictionary," based upon the monumental "New English Dictionary," — the present book will have served at least one worthy purpose. The writer has turned to "The

King's English" again and again; not for suggestions as to the subjects to be discussed, because, as has just been said, these have in all cases been suggested by his daily work, but for assistance in giving a name to a problem, or in stating it — and almost never in vain. The section on "Common Parts," including "Correlatives," is an excellent instance: although all the various "cases" here mentioned under that heading — and some of them are not mentioned by the Messrs. Fowler — were in mind as needing attention, the possibility of grouping them all under one comprehensive title had not suggested itself.

In the Preface the authors say of the plan of their book, that it "was dictated by the following considerations. It is notorious that English writers seldom look into a grammar or composition book; the reading of grammars is repellent because, being bound to be exhaustive on a greater or less scale, they must give much space to the obvious or the unnecessary; and composition books are often useless because they enforce their warnings only by fabricated blunders against which every tyro feels himself quite safe. The principle adopted here has therefore been (1) to pass by all rules, of whatever absolute importance, that are shown by observation to be seldom or never broken; and (2) to illustrate by living examples, with the name of a reputable authority attached

to each, all blunders that observation shows to be common.

"Further, since the positive literary virtues are not to be taught by brief quotations, nor otherwise attained than by improving the gifts of nature with wide or careful reading, whereas something may really be done for the negative virtues by mere exhibition of what should be avoided, the examples collected have had to be examples of the bad and not of the good."

The entertaining quality of the book is due largely to these "examples of the bad," — especially in view of the eminent names often attached to the worst of them, — and to the authors' comments on them. An instance will be found on page 108 below, in connection with Emerson's foible of putting a comma between a noun and its verb. One can but wonder and take courage when one learns of the sins against good English committed by some of the greatest writers, and how curiously addicted some of them seem to be to special idosyncrasies of syntax or punctuation.

The present writer has appropriated only one or two of the Messrs. Fowler's illustrative examples, but has taken his own as they have "happened" in the course of his reading — largely, of proofs, and, to some extent, of miscellaneous works. Only two books — "Sesame and Lilies" and "Diana of the Crossways" — did he reread

for the purpose of finding illustrations of the peculiar methods of punctuation of Ruskin and Meredith. He has not confined himself to "examples of the bad," because the reason alleged by the Messrs. Fowler does not exist in his case; but he has attempted to distinguish between good and bad by a word of explanation or by bracketed words or points, instead of adopting the too schoolbookish device of labeling them "right" or "wrong."

As to very many of the "examples of the bad," it should be said that they were found in "Atlantic" copy in the form in which they are here printed; but that they were corrected to conform to the usage of the office, before appearing in type.

Of the numerous handbooks and textbooks that the author has examined, only one or two seem to call for special mention: not that they are not all that they claim to be, but because, in most of them, the plan touches the plan of this book only at isolated points. He has explained elsewhere[1] the difficulty that he found in making profitable use of Professor Summey's elaborate and painstaking work on "Modern Punctuation,"[2] because its aim seems to be to show what modern punctuation *is*, rather than what it ought to be; but he bears

[1] See under "Punctuation," p. 53 *infra*.

[2] *Modern Punctuation*, by George Summey, Jr., Associate Professor of English in the North Carolina State College. Oxford University Press, 1919.

willing testimony to the fact that, when Professor Summey expresses a definite opinion upon any point, it almost invariably seems a sound one — as will appear more than once in these pages. Mr. Horace Hart's compact little book of "Rules for Compositors and Readers at the University Press, Oxford," which has been reprinted many times (the edition of 1914 was the ninth for publication), has been very useful, as has the late Wendell P. Garrison's entertaining paper, "A Dissolving View of Punctuation," printed in the "Atlantic" for August, 1906.

A new edition was published in 1906 of William Cobbett's "English Grammar" (which first appeared in 1817), with a biographical and critical introduction by Hon. H. L. Stephen of the High Court of Calcutta. The original title-page tells us that the book was "intended for the use of schools and of young persons in general; but more especially for the use of soldiers, sailors, apprentices, and plough-boys" — that is to say, as Judge Stephen suggests, "of persons who, like Cobbett himself, after they had once been taught to read, had to depend entirely on their own resources for anything else that they might wish to learn."

The famous Radical and "Reformer," whose hand was always raised against those in authority, enlisted in the army at the age of 21, and served in New Brunswick from 1785 to 1791, "during

which time he tells us that he learnt grammar. 'The edge of my berth, or that of the guard bed, was my seat to study in, my knapsack was my bookcase; a bit of board lying on my lap was my writing-table; and the task did not demand anything like a year of my life.' Having learnt grammar, he found himself prepared to take up the position which he characteristically describes in the same work: 'How many false pretenders to erudition have I exposed to shame merely by my knowledge of grammar! How many of the insolent and ignorant great and powerful have I pulled down and made little and despicable! And with what ease have I conveyed, upon numerous important subjects, information and instruction to millions now alive, and provided a store of both for millions yet unborn!'"

In the second edition of his book, published in 1822, Cobbett printed a dedication (dated November, 1820) to the hapless Caroline of Brunswick, Queen Consort of George IV, as "the only one amongst all the Royal Personages of the present age that appears to have justly estimated the value of The People." Whatever the merits may have been of the scandalous dissension between that unfortunate, if unwise, lady and the "First Gentleman of Europe," she was at that time the idol of the mob, one of whose spokesmen Cobbett was; and the significance of this dedica-

tion was further emphasized by the inclusion in this second edition of "Six Lessons, intended to prevent statesmen from using false grammar, and from writing in an awkward manner," in which the literary style of the Prince Regent, Speaker Sutton, Lord Castlereagh, the Duke of Wellington, and others, is held up to ridicule, perhaps a bit hypercritically, but with comments that sufficiently disclose the main purpose of the book — to belabor and poke bitter fun at his political enemies.

The "Lesson" on "Specimens of False Grammar, taken from the Writings of Doctor Johnson and from those of Dr. Watts" contains a passage which fully justifies Judge Stephen's remark that "It was thoroughly consistent with the whole of Cobbett's character [he knew absolutely nothing of Latin] that he should despise any knowledge he did not possess."

After referring satirically to the fact that the errors he proposes to point out were committed by the author of a grammar and a dictionary of the English Language and the author of a work on the subject of Logic, who were said to be "two of the most learned men that England ever produced," Cobbett proceeds: —

"Another object, in the producing of these specimens, is to convince you that a knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages does not prevent

men from writing bad English. Those languages are, by impostors, and their dupes, called 'the *learned* languages'; and those who have paid for having studied them, are said to have received 'a *liberal* education.' These appellations are false, and, of course, they lead to false conclusions. *Learning*, as a noun, means *knowledge*, and *learned* means knowing, or *possessed of knowledge*. . . . If the Reports drawn up by the House of Commons, and which are compositions discovering in every sentence ignorance the most profound, were written in Latin, should we then call them *learned?*

"The cause of the use of this false appellation, 'learned languages,' is this, that those who teach them in England have, in consequence of their teaching, *very large estates in house and land*,[1] which are public property, but which are now used for the sole benefit of those teachers, who are, in general, the relations and dependents of the Aristocracy."

In one of the "Lessons" added in the second edition, the author again discharges his spleen, in a different direction.

"I have before me '*A charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester, at a primary visitation of that diocese, by George Tomline, D.D., F.R.S., Lord Bishop of Winchester, Prelate of the*

[1] The italics, both here and below, are all in the original.

Most Noble Order of the Garter.' We will not stop here to inquire what a '*prelate's*' office may require of him relative to an *Order* which history tells us arose out of a *favourite lady* dropping *her garter* at a dance; but, I must observe, that, as the titles here stand, it would appear, that the *last* is deemed the most *honourable*, and of *most importance to the Clergy!* This Bishop, whose name *was* Prettyman, was the *tutor* of that *William Pitt* who was called the *heaven-born* Minister, and a history of whose life has been written by this Bishop. So that we have here, *a Doctor of Divinity*, *a Fellow of the Royal Society*, *a Prelate of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, and a *Bishop of one of the richest sees in the whole world*, who, besides, is an *Historian*, and was *Tutor to a heaven-born Minister*. Let us then see what sort of *writing* comes from such a source."

All this is not to say that there is not much useful instruction and good sense to be found in this extraordinarily entertaining book; but, to quote once more from Judge Stephen's Introduction to the new edition, "the illustrations, drawn from current politics and from the most respectable authorities in contemporary literature, are, after all, the parts of the book which have secured for it whatever position it is that it holds in English literature."

The temptation to quote is so strong that it has

perhaps been yielded to over-much; but the present writer reckons as among the chief compensations of his labor the pleasure due to his having been led to read Cobbett and the Messrs. Fowler.

Something has been said of the use of the "Atlantic" in schools in different parts of the country. Will its use, we wonder, be discouraged by such deliverances as this, reported in the newspapers as this book is being prepared for press? Under the heading, "'It is Me' is all right," we read that the Superintendent of Schools of Cook County, Illinois, of which Chicago forms a very large part, said that "the correct form, 'It is I,' sounds stilted *and even egotistical*, and that it does no good to teach children forms of expression 'outlawed by common usage and *a sense of good form*.'"

If either "common usage" or "a sense of good form" demands "It is me," why does it not demand "Between you and I"? However, there is still a ray of hope for those teachers who prefer not to depart from grammatically correct usage: the Cook County Superintendent does not "instruct" them to teach their pupils to say, "It is me," but simply assures them that they will not be "reprimanded" if they do. And it has been rather encouraging to note the tone of journalistic comment, serious and otherwise, — especially the latter, — on this outbreak.

"The King's English" seems to err on the side

of liberality in this particular matter. "Many educated people feel that in saying *It is I, Whom do you mean?* instead of *It's me, Who do you mean?* they will be talking like a book, and they justifiably prefer geniality to grammar. But in print, unless it is dialogue, the correct forms are advisable."

The word "correct" brings to the writer's mind what might be called an essay on "correctness," which he once received from a contributor to the "Atlantic" (who happened to be an old friend of his), to whom he had suggested changing the phrase "adventures, like some of Dumas's romances," to "adventures, as in some of Dumas's romances."

"You are still, I see, under the load of 'correctness' — that is, you want all sentences to be able to pass the examination tests of Harvard College and Hill's rhetoric. Now the first thing on which you make a suggestion, of 'as in' for 'like,' is a regular old stock mistake, if you choose to call it so, in all the best writers from Homer down. A comparison is made between a thing in one connection, and the same thing, or the like thing, in another — but in order to be concise instead of lumbering, the author makes his comparison directly with a person, place, book, with which the second thing is connected. Homer says, 'Hair like the Graces,' — not 'like that of the Graces'; Livy says, 'the most just triumph since Camillus,' —

not 'since the triumph of Camillus.' It is perfectly true that 'adventures' are not like 'Dumas's romances' — they are like 'the adventures in,' or 'those of,' etc.; but the 'jumping comparison' is a commonplace device."

Doubtless, it is perfectly true also that strict compliance with the rules of syntax sometimes result in "lumbering" phraseology; but it is believed, nevertheless, to be the better and safer way, not to insist that an author shall always write with absolute correctness, but to make sure, if possible, whether he really desires to depart from it.

A word as to the shape in which copy should be sent in for consideration, and for printing if accepted.

There is no question that typewritten copy, if reasonably well done, is most desirable; but it can be so bad that fairly legible long-hand is to be preferred to it; and some of that sent in to the "Atlantic" is of a quality likely to prevent its being considered on the merit of its contents.

It is sometimes difficult to decide whether the badness of a manuscript is due to imperfections in the machine or to the inexpertness of the operator; occasionally the poor quality of the paper is to blame; but one or another, or all three, are the occasion of a great deal of unnecessary trouble and waste of time in editing the copy, besides greatly

increasing the chances of mistakes in the type — to the author's disadvantage.

1. A good machine, in which all letters and other characters print with equal force and distinctness, and in which the alignment is accurate, is the first desideratum.

2. All typewritten copy should be double spaced: that is to say, with space between every two lines for another line. There are inevitably some changes or corrections to be made, and without this extra space they cannot be made clearly and intelligibly.

3. It is a fact that, in a very large proportion of manuscripts submitted, the capitals are often printed below the line and very indistinctly. This is presumably due to careless handling of the shift-key. It can hardly fail to be noticed if the manuscript is revised; and the letters should be mended by the author, instead of being left to those who have the printing in charge. This may seem to be a small matter; but it has been the occasion of endless trouble; for sometimes these half-printed capitals simulate other letters, and a key-board operator will almost always act on first impressions, without regard to sense.

4. Another, less common, case of careless manipulation has been noticed in several manuscripts recently examined. Wherever a hyphen or a dash was called for, the character intended to be used

to indicate that a word is to be italicized was struck, instead, and, of course, appeared below the line. In editing the copy, it was necessary to change every last one of them, for otherwise the key-board operator would naturally have been misled.

5. Many untrained typists pay no attention whatever to the division of words at the end of a line. They will stop anywhere in a word, with most monstrous and laughable results. Here again, to say nothing of the momentary check and hesitation in reading, the key-board operator finds, and is likely to grasp, an excuse for going wrong: if she finds *bough* divided *boug-h* in the copy, why should she not divide it so in the type, if it happens to come at the end of a line? This is not a fanciful suggestion, as experience proves, although the example seems like a *reductio ad absurdum*.[1] Some typists, who might baulk at such divisions, will take the other horn of the dilemma, and when they reach the margin of the paper with a word unfinished, will disregard the remaining letters and begin the new line with the next word. Failure to correct such faults as these indicates either a very hasty revision of the manuscript, or none at all, and may lead a proof-reader to expect other faults,

[1] See under "Spacing and Syllabification," p. 47 *infra*, a memorandum of certain divisions that have actually been made *in type;* even worse ones are constantly found in typewritten MS.

and so to find them even where they do not exist.

6. A carbon copy of a manuscript is always inferior in legibility to the original, and should never be sent, unless for some very convincing reason. It is unfair to everybody connected with the magazine: to the editor, who has to read it to decide upon its availability; to the person who has to prepare it for the press; to compositors and proof-readers; and last, but by no means least, to the author himself, because of the danger of mistakes in deciphering the blurred and indistinct words. For a like reason, paper that takes a good clear impression, and is thick enough to be easily handled, should be used for the original copy.

7. The manuscript should be revised with care. It often happens, even when it bears indications of having been revised, that the corrections are made so hastily and carelessly as to be practically unreadable. Special attention should be given in revising to any points as to which the author is desirous that the copy should be followed. The office always tries to verify the spelling of proper names and the accuracy of quotations; but the necessary reference books may not be at hand, and the sources of quotations are not always given and may very well not be recognized. Quotations in foreign tongues should be revised with all possible care. *Quorum pars parva qui*, which was actually found in a recently accepted manuscript,

would not look well in print; nor is *statu quo*, used as a nominative, likely to escape animadversion from some of the "Atlantic's" friendly critics. Errors in such particulars are rather likely to be charged to the editor of the magazine, when they are really chargeable to the author. As has been said elsewhere in this book, one fails to recall a manuscript in which absolute consistency has been found, even in respect to matters as to which the author has been most insistent that copy should be followed.

The duty of paragraphing, too, is much too frequently left to the editor. As an extreme case, the writer recalls a MS. of some 6000 words, which passed through his hands very recently, in which no paragraphs at all were indicated. And in this connection he takes occasion to refer to the unpleasant practice affected by some authors of beginning every paragraph at the margin of the type script, so that there is no indication that a new paragraph is intended, except when a broken line occurs. This criticism applies to all the manuscripts submitted by a certain highly esteemed "Atlantic" contributor, the result being that, in editing his copy, it is necessary to mark every paragraph, at a considerable expenditure of time and labor.

To sum up, it is most essential that copy should be neatly and correctly written on good paper,

and that the original, *not* a carbon copy, should be presented; that it should be revised and corrected carefully by the author, with special reference to paragraphing and to the verification of quotations and references; and that there should be space between the lines for the changes and corrections that are quite certain to be necessary.

There are several reasons why it must inevitably happen that there neither has been nor will be any copy of the magazine printed in which it will not be possible to find one or more instances of apparent disregard of the rules and principles laid down herein — to say nothing of absolute errors.

In the first place, the copy is often in such condition that it cannot be properly "edited," except at the cost of more time and pains than can be given to it: the fault may be either in the physical condition of the manuscript, or in inconsistencies in matters of punctuation, use of words, and so forth, or in actual bad grammar. If, under these circumstances, errors or inconsistencies get into the type, they may or may not be discovered; and if they are discovered, the work may then have progressed so far that it is too late to correct anything but genuine errors, — which, of course, have to be corrected whenever they come to light, if the page is not actually on the press, — and in that

case inconsistencies are left, to confound us later.[1] These remarks apply chiefly to the magazine; with books, the work is, of course, less hurried.

In the second place, the author may insist upon having his own way in some things; and in books his wishes are naturally consulted.

In the third and last and most important place, proof-readers are not infallible, no matter how zealous and well-intentioned they may be; one who is not familiar with the business naturally finds it hard to understand how the same perfectly obvious error can go undetected through proof after proof and be passed by reader after reader; but it has always happened, it happens now, and it always will happen.

It is believed that there is in the rules and principles set forth in these pages nothing which, if they are judiciously applied, should tend to produce — what is, of all things, to be most sedulously avoided — a monotonous sameness of style in the works of contributors and authors whose individual styles may differ as widely as the subjects on which they write, or as their ideas.

[1] A correspondent writes very lately that he has been "deeply pained" to find "Encyclopedia Brittanica," spelled thus in the *Atlantic*. His pain was caused by the extra *t* and the missing *n* in *Britannica;* but the responsible reader was much less disturbed by this manifest typographical error, than by the failure to spell *Encyclopædia* with the diphthong, which is found in the title of the work — to say nothing of Atlantic usage.

Indeed, the Atlantic office would be quite unwilling to commit itself irrevocably to the literal performance of every precept in the following pages. It does try to save authors from unwitting blunders. It does not try to impose its preferences, in points that are open to question, impartially upon all the authors with whose work it deals. Yet it is a fact that the "Atlantic," in the course of its sixty-odd years, is popularly supposed to have achieved a standard of literary excellence; and it is the endeavor of all those concerned in its production — as well as in the production of the books that bear the imprint of the Atlantic Monthly Press — to maintain that standard unimpaired.

PROOF-READERS AND PROOF-READING

"PROOF-READING," says a distinguished member of the profession, "as a distinct department in the work of a printing-office, does not date from the very earliest days of 'the art preservative of all arts.' The first products of the printing-press show abundant evidence of the non-existence of anyone specially charged with the duty of correcting the compositors' mistakes."[1]

Before it became the regular practice of printers to employ correctors of the press [2] as an essential part of their establishment, it was a customary thing for authors to send the proofs of their works to their friends for revision; "and in the universities and colleges sheets of works passing through the press were frequently hung up in the quadrangles for public inspection and correction."

With the growth of printing, systematic proof-reading began to be recognized as a necessity; and the demand was met at first by the adoption by leading printers of the practice of engaging men

[1] Sir Theodore Martin is said to have estimated that the typographical errors in the First Folio Shakespeare amount to 20,000, or two and a fourth per cent of the whole number of words in the volume.

[2] "Corrector of the press" is the name still used in England.

of letters and scholars to read their proofs. Among the many eminent men who are supposed to have accepted such employment are Goldsmith and Dr. Johnson; and the elder D'Israeli once wrote that "it became the glory of the learned to be correctors of the press to eminent printers."

Tempora mutantur, and no mistake! In these days "the learned" are only too prone to scamp the reading of their own proofs; and "to-day in every printing-office the proof-reader is found — an unobtrusive functionary, known to publishers, authors, editors, and journalists, but for the most part unknown to the general reading public; a functionary who yet does useful, always valuable, and often indispensable work. The influence of good proof-reading upon the character of book, newspaper, and general printing is too often underrated. The celebrated old printing-offices and the foremost of the modern ones owe their reputation for good workmanship largely to the excellence and thoroughness of the work done in their reading-rooms, for no perfection of paper, ink, machining, or binding can atone for bad or slipshod typography."[1]

The business of proof-reading was from the outset, and for many years, followed exclusively by men. Of late years, however, in this as in many other callings, the steadily increasing encroach-

[1] *Encyclopædia Britannica.*

ment of the female persuasion has resulted, in the United States, in pushing the sterner sex out to a large extent, until now the male proof-reader — except in newspaper offices — is almost as extinct as the dodo. In England, a different condition obtains, and women readers are rarely met with.[1]

There is no question that it is a very great advantage to a reader to have had experience as a compositor, because so large a part of the work is concerned with detecting typographical errors. "To be a useful reader," wrote the late T. L. De Vinne, founder of the famous De Vinne Press, "one should know types by their names and understand the technical terms and the methods of a printing house. There is also much to be learned in the routine of proof-reading, which is acquired most thoroughly by the young compositor or copy-holder. There are a few excellent readers who have not been printers or copy-holders, but the readers of most utility are those who have held copy or set type from their youth."

The introduction of the type-setting machine, which has now practically put the old-time hand-compositor out of business, has naturally been followed by a rapid decrease in the supply of compositor-candidates for the position of proof-reader. The young women who operate the Monotype

[1] It may be that this, like so many other things, has been changed by the World War.

key-boards soon learn that speed is the first requisite, and seldom stop to correct (even if they discover them) the frequent errors that they make by striking the wrong key. Nor do they pause — perhaps they should not — to consider whether the copy, as they read it, makes sense or nonsense. Consequently, they seldom acquire from experience even a modicum of the expert knowledge that might fit them to read proof, as experience with the more leisurely process of hand-composition was supposed to do.

The "copy-holder" is the person who reads the copy aloud while the "first reader" follows on the galley proof;[1] it is, of course, essential that she shall be familiar with the whole terminology of the trade, — the technical printer's names for all punctuation marks, and so forth, — and, most of all, that she shall be careful and accurate in her reading.[2] It is the almost invariable rule that

[1] The proof that is "pulled" from the type as it is first set, and before it is made up into pages.

[2] "To ensure accuracy," says Mr. De Vinne, "the copy-holder is required to call out every paragraph, mark of punctuation, and italicized word, which he [she] does in a sing-song voice, clipping the names of the points in the copy." For example, a person listening while a copy-holder read the sentence to which this note is appended, would hear this: "The open quote copy hyph. holder close is the person who reads the copy aloud while the open quote first reader close follows on the galley proof sem. sup. one it is com. of course com. essential that she shall be familiar with the whole terminology of the trade com. dash the technical printer pos. s names" — and so forth.

proof-readers shall pass through this stage of training, which is of the utmost value.

The first reader's duty is to see that the type "follows copy," as it is read to her (or him) by the copy-holder. Her task in this respect has been made much heavier than it was in the old days of hand-composition, because the errors made by the key-board operator, in her subordination of care and intelligence to speed, are vastly more numerous. For, despite the malevolent ingenuity of the old-time "comp." in making blunders and in trying to avoid their consequences when made, the task that he set the reader was a comparatively simple one, especially if her (or his) service had been long enough to make her familiar with his "tricks."

Among the compositors who are employed in correcting in the type the manifold errors of the type-setting machine, there are those who seem inclined to think that anything that happens to be strange to them must be wrong, and to "correct" it on their own responsibility. The writer has recently been told of one such person who, without comment, changed "the *gnu* stood with its feet wide apart," to "the *gun* stood," etc.; and only careful revision detected the change at the eleventh hour. In another instance, the fact that a certain English family chooses to spell its name *ffrench* was so offensive to those who had to do

with setting it, that only by almost superhuman effort did the name finally get printed properly, without a capital.

The first reader's duties are properly confined to making the type agree with the copy.[1] She may correct errors as to which there is no possible question; but it is safer in practically every case to content herself with calling the author's attention to what *seems* to be an error. An amusing instance of a reader's over-confidence in her own judgment in this regard came recently under the writer's eye. Mary Fitton, who lived in the early part of the seventeenth century, — she has been sometimes, but with little probability, identified with the "dark lady" of Shakespeare's sonnets, — was referred to in a certain article as "Mary Fitton, a shade three hundred years old." The reader, thinking that she had caught the author in a slip, corrected the phrase, on her own authority and without comment, to what she thought it ought to be — "Mary Fitton, a shade [that is to say, "a little"] *over* three hundred years old." And even more recently, the word "peremptorily" was set "*preemptorily*," and *somebody*, in obedience to an

[1] This statement is accurate with regard to at least one large printing-office, and all Atlantic work. But the writer is informed that, in most offices, the first reading is considered the more important, the style being set and all critical work done on the galley proof, and the final reader's duties being confined to typographical and mechanical matters only.

office rule laid down elsewhere in this book, instead of correcting the spelling, made the impossible word conform to Atlantic style, by putting a diæresis over the second *e* — *preëmptorily*.

Another instance may be cited, of a different sort, in which both copy-holder and first reader failed to detect the divagation of a key-board operator. A valued contributor to the "Atlantic" sent in a paper written in his own hand, — an execrable hand, it must be confessed, — which, when it reached the present writer in galley proof, contained the following remarkable statement: "If in a certain city a thousand people die of typhoid fever every year, that is a digestible food"! Inspection of the copy showed that, while the words in question did look like "digestible food," they actually were written for "deplorable fact." But neither copy-holder nor reader had, apparently, noticed the lack of sense — perhaps because they were attempting to break the speed record; for under present conditions, readers, as well as key-boarders, sometimes have to work with one eye on the calendar and the other on the clock. It is lamentably true that this insistence upon working on time has much to do with the inadequate training that readers receive in the present day.

When the galley proofs have been returned by the author with his corrections, and those correc-

tions have been duly made, the type is cut up into pages of the requisite length, with head-lines and page numbers, — in printers' parlance, "made up," — another proof is pulled and, when it has been revised, to see that all corrections marked on the galleys have been properly made, the pages are "put in chase" or "locked up" immovably in heavy iron frames ("chases"). At this stage another proof is taken and handed to another reader, whose duty it is to give it a final critical reading, before the type is sent to the foundry, where it is electrotyped, and the plates are made from which the magazine or book is to be printed.

The "final reading" stage is that in which those qualities of the proof-reader with which authors and editors have most to do come chiefly into play; and it is the "final reader" who is the subject of what follows.

"Commend me to the whole tribe of proof-readers for readiness to teach Peary where the pole is, or the Lord Chancellor who are in the Upper House." This outburst from an eminent scholar who was, in his lifetime, a not infrequent contributor to the "Atlantic," was called forth by a well-meant query on a proof-sheet as to a statement made by him in a certain article. The sarcasm was, perhaps, justified in that case, especially as the offense was aggravated by referring the author to "Whitaker's Almanac"! but it is

typical of the attitude of a good many authors, who fail to appreciate the "useful, always valuable, and often indispensable work" done by that "obscure functionary," the proof-reader.

"A broader knowledge of the frequency of faults in writing," says Mr. De Vinne, "should lead to a better appreciation of the services of the proof-reader; but this knowledge is rarely acquired out of a printing-house. The undisciplined writer who believes that he is careful and exact often resents the suggestion that he can be indebted to the proof-reader for help of any kind. The too-rapid and over-confident writer, who may have been provoked by too many queries from the reader (for there are amateurs who can be as irritating as mosquitoes), may peremptorily order that his copy be followed in every particular. Not a comma or a capital must be changed. Writers like these put the reader in an unpleasant position. To query a supposed error is an offense to the writer; to pass an indefensible error is to offend the employer and incur discredit as a competent reader. Yet the positive order to follow copy may lead to unhappy results when the author cannot see the proof of his writing."

Even the poet Cowper, supposed to have been the soul of amiability, accused a reader who tried to "improve" his poems of "rash and gratuitous emendation," and of being "a presumptuous

intermeddler." And the gentle Emerson once confided to his Journal the unwontedly savage remark that proof-readers were never willing to admit that an author knew anything about his subject — or words to that effect. One very famous novelist, whose style has certain peculiarities, to say the least, discouraged proof-readers from calling attention to anything — this within the writer's own experience — by a constantly reiterated direction to "follow copy"; and another, in a letter to the editor of the "Atlantic" apropos of a reader's query on a proof, expressed a pious wish that American proof-readers would follow the example of their British brethren, and confine themselves to the correction of typographical errors, and not burden themselves with the self-imposed task of criticizing the text before them.

If writers in general were more given to a realization of the fact that errors — not in spelling and grammar and punctuation alone — will frequently find a way into their copy, however inerrant they themselves may be; that typists are occasionally careless; that the typewritten copy is not *invariably* revised with care; and that even the fact that one has become an author does not of itself make one's handwriting legible (if, indeed, it has not a contrary effect) — if they were more prone to realize these things, they would be readier to admit that the value of the service of a painstaking

proof-reader is not measured altogether by the *typographical* errors that he detects. And if they should then proceed to search their hearts as to their fashion of treating readers' queries, they would perhaps be moved to look more leniently on the *manner* of querying, which may sometimes seem over-bumptious.

One can scarcely deny that many proof-readers are stupid, many pigheaded, and a very large number wise in their own conceit, and "sot" in their ideas. "There are amateur readers," says Mr. De Vinne, "who unduly magnify their office, and seize every occasion to show the author their critical knowledge of rhetoric, etymology, and punctuation. . . . The irritability of an author may be justly provoked by the meddling queries of a captious reader, who suggests corrections where they are not needed." But it can be most emphatically denied that, as a *class*, they are consumed by an overpowering itch to prove their superior knowledge. The attitude of the average reader would be fairly expressed by some such formula as this: These queries addressed to the author are inspired by no purpose to be presuming or impertinent, or to suggest superior knowledge on the reader's part; but they are made solely because of the possibility that the author has overlooked what may be an error, or that the suggestions may not have occurred to him, but, on being brought

to his attention, may commend themselves to his judgment.

Authors are often annoyed by the habit that many readers have of underscoring a word or words in the text and placing a question mark in the margin, with no indication of its significance. A reader should *never* "query" anything without an intelligible explanation of the reason for doing so.

Queries may be discharged at almost every phase of authorship, — if that is a legitimate expression, — short of the religious, political, or literary views of the author. The reader may call attention to peculiarities of spelling or punctuation or capitalization, to which the author seems to be addicted; to what she (or he) believes to be a misstatement of fact, a misquotation, or a mistake in a name or a date; or may suggest changes in the arrangement or choice of words. In the writer's experience of nearly twenty years he has seen the most incredible errors get into type *because they were in the copy*. Sometimes, if the reader is sure of his facts, he will correct the error, and the author never knows that he made it; but if there is a bare possibility that it may be no error, then the query should be written on the proof, and the author should be asked to settle it. In very many cases within the writer's knowledge, the detection of the error was acknowledged with

an expression of gratitude; and in many others — it was not.

Many authors seem to feel instinctively that proof-readers generally mean to be helpful and not presumptuous. One of the most popular of professors and lecturers once said that his experience as an editor had taught him how great was the indebtedness to "the fellows in velveteen jackets, with short briar-wood pipes in their mouths," who read the proofs. The fellow in a velveteen jacket is generally a spectacled lady in bombazine, — if there is any such material, — but the indebtedness is there, none the less.

Charles Dickens once said: "I know from some slight practical experience what the duties of correctors of the press are, and how these duties are usually discharged. And I can testify . . . that they are not mechanical — that they are not mere matters of manipulation and routine; but that they require from those who perform them much natural intelligence, much superadded cultivation, considerable readiness of reference, quickness of resource, an excellent memory, and a clear understanding. And I must gratefully acknowledge that I have never gone through the sheets of any book I have written without having had presented to me by the corrector of the press something I had overlooked — some slight inconsistency into which I had fallen — some little

mistake I had made — in short, without having set down in black and white some unquestionable indication that I had been closely followed in my work by a patient and trained mind, and not merely by a skilful eye." And Robert Browning was equally emphatic, if less diffuse: "I have had every opportunity of becoming acquainted with, and gratefully acknowledging, the extreme service rendered to me; and if mine be no exceptional case the qualifications of readers and correctors are important indeed."

It seems clear from Dickens's testimony that in his time the British corrector was not the mere machine which he was represented to be by the author who wished that his American confrères would copy him. Sir Walter Besant and the editors of the "Century Dictionary" and of the "Dictionary of National Biography" have also cheerfully and publicly testified to the helpfulness of the proof-reader.

It is said above that queries should stop short of suggestions concerning the religious, political, or literary views of the author. Indeed, it is almost fatal to the usefulness of a reader that she should stop to consider whether or not such views accord with her own. To forbid a reader to entertain any views would be idle, of course; but she must be able to forget them so far as not to allow herself to be distracted from her task. A case

comes to mind, of a reader of very pronounced religious views who was given, to read, a volume of sermons by a minister of a denomination very far removed from that to which the reader belonged. The consequence was that the proofs were laden with controversial arguments upon various points of doctrine, while typographical errors went unheeded. It was the first book that had been given to that reader, and, after the author's rather pointed comments had been received, it was decided that it should be the last. This was an extreme — indeed, a unique — case; but the writer has had personal knowledge of many instances of less flagrant attempts to "reason" with an author, which have resulted in a *mauvais quart d'heure* for the reader.

A great part of what has been said thus far bears more relation to the proofs of books, which are printed under the author's direct supervision, than to those of the "Atlantic," which, in many cases, are never seen by the author. A few words about these latter may not, then, be out of place.

The work on the magazine is done at the press by a force specially assigned to it. The schedule of articles for the month having been prepared by the editor, the copy is "edited" by his assistant, and is then sent to the press, where it is gone over again by the reader who has the magazine in her charge there. When an article has been put in

type, the galley proofs are read by a first reader and sent to the editorial office, where they are read a second time. After this second reading, they are either sent to the author or returned to the press.[1]

At a certain fixed date in each month, the "make-up" of the magazine begins; that is to say, the galleys are cut into columns of the proper length, the pages are made up, and proofs are taken of the pages. These proofs are revised at the press by the final reader and are then sent to the office, with all long or short columns marked, and bearing any queries that the reader thinks it well to make. They are then read by the editor's assistant, and during this reading all matters of the adjustment of columns and pages, the "fitting in" of articles, and the rest, are attended to — subject always to a change in the schedule if ordered by the editor.

We intend that at least every second article shall begin a new page, and are generally able to carry out that purpose. But as an author cannot

[1] When proofs are sent to the author, they bear only such queries as relate to the substance of the article, such matters as punctuation, spelling, and the like being made to conform to the regular Atlantic style, except in very rare cases. If, as frequently happens, the proofs are not returned before the article is reached in the "make-up," such corrections as the author may desire have to be made in the page; and sometimes the make-up has progressed so far that it is impossible to make extensive changes without disproportionate trouble and labor, and — what is more important — loss of valuable time.

be expected to measure his article beforehand so that it shall fill, say, seven pages of the magazine if it runs over six, it sometimes happens that there has to be some compression done, to avoid beginning several successive articles in the middle of a page. All such matters are, as has been said, adjusted in the reading of the first page proofs. These proofs are then returned to the press, and after the changes and corrections have been made, the pages are "locked up" immovably in the "chases" in which they are to be sent to the electrotyping foundry. Another proof is then taken, and is read by the final reader before being sent to the office, where it, too, is read a second time for final corrections and changes. These proofs being returned, and the necessary corrections made, still another proof is taken, and the pages are then sent to the foundry. This last-named proof is sent to the office without being read, and is there glanced over merely, for possible imperfections.

After the pages have been electrotyped and the plates have been finished, a proof is taken from the plates, and that proof is read at the press before the actual printing begins. This ends the reading of proofs. As will be seen there have been in all *six* readings, and yet — it is needless to remind the critical readers of the magazine — errors find their way in; often they start in the type-setting machine and go undetected through

every reading. And as to consistency in the matters of which this book treats — well, perfect consistency has never been attained, and probably never will be. But enough has been said to show that an effort is made to that end. And so far as that effort is successful, credit is due in great measure to the reader at the Rumford Press who is in charge of the "Atlantic," and of those Atlantic books that are printed there, and who has, with keen intelligence and with unfailing zeal and goodwill, shared the present writer's labors lo, these many years.

SPACING AND SYLLABIFICATION

THESE two subjects are almost necessarily considered together, when, as in the case of the "Atlantic" itself, and in Atlantic books generally, evenness of spacing, bearing upon the appearance of the page, is regarded as an important element in the make-up. As the width of the page decreases, the difficulty of securing even spacing increases; it reaches its height when, as in the magazine, the text is set in two narrow columns; and the chief remedy — aside from more or less freedom in the interchangeable use of commas, dashes, and parentheses to inclose parenthetical or semi-parenthetical clauses — lies in practising some eclecticism in the division of words, or syllabification.

The "authorities" are so far apart in attempting to prescribe rules to govern this last subject, and the so-called rules are, in every case, subject to so many exceptions and qualifications, that it seems hardly worth while, although the temptation is strong, to refer to them at any considerable length. A specimen or two must suffice.

A favorite rule is that words should be divided on "a vowel, *wherever possible*"; and to this a certain otherwise useful handbook appends the

further question-begging proviso, "and when it is a correct division"!

In the "Manual of Style" of the University of Chicago Press we are told in one section to "divide on a vowel wherever practicable," and in another section to divide "according to pronunciation (the American system), not according to derivation (the English system)." And these are the examples given under the first: "*sepa-rate*, not *sep-arate; particu-lar*, not *partic-ular; criti-cism*, not *crit-icism*"; in each of these three cases the tabooed division would be quite proper according to the second rule — divide according to pronunciation. And now note the examples given under the second rule: "*democ-racy*, not *demo-cracy; aurif-erous*, not *auri-ferous; antip-odes*, not *anti-podes*" — in each of which the propriety of dividing on the vowel is forgotten. Taking the examples by themselves, we might deduce this rule: divide on a vowel when possible, unless by so doing you might chance to divide according to the derivation. But confusion is made worse confounded by still another direction: "As far as is compatible with pronunciation and good spacing, however, divide compounds on *etymological lines, or according to derivation and meaning*"!

In the same "Manual" a fine distinction is drawn, which is believed to be unique in that it makes the division of a certain class of derivatives

depend upon the accentuation of the "parent-word." "In derivatives from words ending in *t*, the *t* in divisions should be carried into the next line with the suffix if the accent has been shifted; if the derivative has retained the accent of the parent word, the *t* should be left in the first line: *objec-tive* (from ob'ject); *defect-ive* (from defect')." Imagine a compositor stopping to reflect on such a distinction as this! And what about *objection* and *defection*, which also are derivatives from the same "parent-words": must we divide *objec-tion* and *defect-ion?*

The following helpful paragraph is taken from "A Practical Guide for Authors," by W. S. Booth: —

"In present participles carry over the *ing: divid-ing*, *mak-ing*, *forc-ing*, *charg-ing*, (but *twin-kling*, *chuc-kling*, *dan-cing*, etc.)."

Why the distinction between *forc-ing* and *dan-cing;* and what does the "etc." include? Why not *twink-ling* and *chuck-ling*, if these words must be divided?

Another equally illuminating direction from the same work is this: —

"Divide in all cases *espe-cial*, *inhabit-ant*, *pecul-iar*, *pro-cess*, *know-ledge*, *atmos-phere*, and *hemi-sphere.*"

The significance of "in all cases" is far from clear; and the distinction between the last two

divisions is particularly subtle; who can say that the *s* is pronounced with the second syllable in the one case and not in the other?

All this goes to show that the best-meant attempts to lay down strict rules for the division of words that can be, without apparent offense, divided in more than one way inevitably end in contradictions *inter se*, when they are not so vague as to be useless; and, furthermore, that some authority can be quoted for almost any division that is not manifestly absurd.

According to Mr. Horace Hart, in the division of English words, "The principle is that the part of the word left at the end of a line should suggest the part commencing on the next line. Thus the word 'happiness' should be divided *happi-ness*, not *hap-piness*."[1] The difficulty with this otherwise admirable principle is that it will often be impossible to find room on a line for enough of a fairly long word to answer the purpose. It is not necessary even to resort to such an extreme example as that which Mr. Hart himself uses to point out the limits of usefulness of his principle. "I was once asked," he says, "how I would carry out the rule . . . in such a case as 'disproportionableness,' which, according to Sir James Murray, is one of the longest words in the English language; or 'incircumscriptibleness,' used by one

[1] *Rules for Compositors and Readers*, etc., p. 54.

Byfield, a divine, in 1615; . . . or again, 'anti-disestablishmentarians,' quoted in the biography of Archbishop Benson."

Other things being equal, the pronunciation system is probably the best (with such regard as can conveniently be paid to Mr. Hart's principle that the part of the word left in the first line should suggest what is coming); but here again we are confronted by the question: What is the proper pronunciation? And again, where two consonants come together, as in *importance*, for example, can we say dogmatically that they are divided in pronunciation, and that the *t* necessarily goes with the last syllable?

The purpose of this tedious discussion is to explain the latitude allowed in the "Atlantic," and to a lesser degree in Atlantic books, in the matter of division of words, in the interest of even spacing. "Questions of division involve questions of white space. Ideal division may be less important than good spacing."[1]

There are a few hard-and-fast rules, which may not be waived even in the magazine.

1. One-letter divisions are never permissible. Dissyllabic words, like *enough*, *among*, and others, which could not conceivably be divided except after the first letter, *must* be kept together.

2. Words consisting strictly of one syllable can-

[1] Summey, *Modern Punctuation*, p. 174.

not be divided: *through*, *whilst*, and, of course, innumerable others. The word "strictly" is intended to exclude from the rule certain words, like the past tense or past participle of some verbs, which, although they are now pronounced as one syllable, except occasionally in verse, actually contain two syllables and were originally so pronounced.[1] For example: it is permissible — though undesirable, and to be avoided if possible — to divide *approv-ed*, *advanc-ed*, as an alternative to very bad spacing.

3. No more than three hyphens may be printed at the ends of successive lines. If this cannot be avoided without bad spacing, it must be left for the reader or editor to adjust.

4. When the past tense or present participle of a verb is formed by doubling the final consonant, the added letter *must* always be turned over with *ed* or *ing: control-ling*, not *controll-ing*. When the verb itself ends with a double consonant, it is better to turn over only the ending; but the rule is not absolute, except in the case of short verbs of one syllable: *add-ed*, not *ad-ded; pass-ing*, not *pas-sing*.

5. The terminations *cial*, *sial*, *tial*, *cion*, *sion*, *tion*, *cious*, must be treated always *by compositors*

[1] This is shown, of course, by the use in older books, and sometimes, even now, in poetry, of the apostrophe (*prov'd*) when the second syllable was to be elided. On the other hand, we now print *provèd*, when that syllable is to be pronounced.

as indivisible; the rare occasions when the first letter may be left behind should be passed upon by the proof-reader.

6. If the turning-over of a part of the last word of a paragraph is unavoidable, it *must not* contain less than four letters.

7. There are many properly called impossible divisions, aside from those included under paragraph 2 above, of which it is impracticable to make any sort of list. The question whether a division falls within this category must be left to the common sense of the compositor, controlled by the reader. A few obvious instances of divisions never admissible under any circumstances are: *Oxf-ord*, *jud-gment*, *reme-mber*, *assoc-iation*, *pri-nciples*.[1] Not even in narrow measure are words ending in *ckle* — *buckle*, *chuckle*, *pickle*, etc. — to be divided; although *chuc-kle*, etc., are allowed by some "authorities."

8. The abbreviations A.M. (Master of Arts), Ph.D., and other degrees, I.W.W., Y.M.C.A., A.M. (*ante meridiem*), P.M., A.D., and B.C. must *never* be divided.

[1] While preparing this book for the press the writer noted these divisions made by compositors on the *Atlantic: thro-ughout*, *ach-ieved*, *smuggl-ing*, *pe-oples! She-lter*, too, has come under the writer's eye; and the editor of another magazine, finding *ashamed* divided thus on his proof, "wanted to know" if it was correct. In another case, the compositor, having put an extra *i* in "requisites," divided it thus: requisi-ties.

NOTE. — In the "Atlantic" it is allowable to divide the same word differently in the same article, and even, though preferably not, on the same page.

The above are the only rules of syllabification, deviations from which are forbidden in the "Atlantic" itself. *A fortiori* they are forbidden in all Atlantic books; and in all of the latter in which the measure is 20 picas or more, and in the magazine when even spacing or the exigencies of the make-up will permit, these additional rules are to be followed.

9. Two-letter divisions *at the end of a word* are to be avoided.

This qualification in italics is added with intention, because the prohibition is commonly extended to similar divisions at the beginning of a word; whereas there are many prefixes, like *ex*, *in*, *de*, *be*, *ab*, which can, with perfect propriety, be left by themselves.

10. The forms pronounced as single syllables, though really consisting of two (see paragraph 2 above), must not be divided.

11. Avoid, if possible, dividing the last word on a right-hand page. When it must be done, it is more than ever desirable to let the part left behind suggest the rest of the word; and in no case must less than three letters be turned over.

12. Avoid, if possible, dividing the first element of a compound word; otherwise two hyphens

having different values are brought too close together.

13. Do not divide the initials of a name: *J. H./ Smith* — not *J. / H. Smith.*

14. Where subdivisions are indicated in a paragraph by (*a*), (*b*), (1), (2), etc., do not end a line with one of such figures or letters.

The following rules as to the use of "spaces" are believed to result in improving the appearance of the page, although some of them are at variance with those followed by many printers.

1. Never resort to "letter-spacing" — separating the letters of a word — in order to fill out a widely spaced line.[1]

2. Never spread out a normally spaced line in order to make a new line.

3. Never begin a page or a column with the last line of a paragraph unless it is a *full*, normally spaced line.

4. When the contracted form *n't*, for *not*, is used in conjunction with a verb, it is to be set and treated as a separate word, as if it were spelled in full.

EXCEPTIONS. — When the contracted form is pronounced as one syllable, — *don't, can't, shan't, wa'n't,* — it is set as a single word. Also *won't* and *ain't,* in which the spelling is changed.

[1] This device is much used in magazines that have illustrations set into the pages, leaving but little room for type between the illustration and the side of the page.

5. A thin space is always set before the verb in the contractions *'t is*, *'t was*, *'t would*, etc.; also in *I'm*, *I'll*, *he's*, *you're*, *she'd* (she would), and the like; and in contractions occurring in colloquial or vulgar writing, where the first letter, or letters, of a word are elided, as: "I don't *know's* I will"; "He was *worse'n* I was." But when, notwithstanding the omission of the letters, the two words are not run together in reading, but are pronounced distinctly as separate syllables, the same space is used between them as in the rest of the line; as, for example, *take 'em*.

The whole matter of even spacing is beset with difficulty, so far as the ordinary book or magazine is concerned, owing to the carelessness and indifference of compositors and the reluctance of printers to comply with the directions of proof-readers, editors, and authors by doing the necessary overrunning to produce the desired result. And the difficulty is, of course, the greater, the narrower the page or column. The utmost that can be hoped for is to secure a page in which widely spaced and thinly spaced lines will not be in such close juxtaposition that one gets an impression of broad expanses of white paper, with unmitigated black bands above and below. In the good old days when compositors set type by hand and "worked by the piece," they were required to

correct flagrantly bad spacing in their own time. But in these days of machine-composition, as key-board operators work by the hour, and cannot be called upon to do their work over, their efficiency is gauged altogether by the number of *ems* they can set in a given time.[1] So that the printer, having to pay for the time spent in correcting bad work, is rather prone to deny that the work is bad. It is possible, often, to avoid controversy by adding or taking out a word, by substituting *though* for *although*, *on* for *upon*, or *vice versa*, or by a slight change of construction; and, in the magazine especially, this method is not infrequently resorted to.

[1] The writer recently read a galley proof which disclosed that the key-board operator, coming to the end of a thinly spaced line, found that she had no room for the last two letters of "improved." Instead of resetting the line, she ignored the letters, and went on with the next word. When the letters were replaced, the whole syllable, "-proved," had to be taken over into the next line, with the result that almost an entire long paragraph had to be overrun. Perhaps the obligation to bear the expense caused by such carelessness accounts for the printer's reluctance to comply with what he sometimes calls an "even-spacing fad."

PUNCTUATION

In Letter XIV of Cobbett's "English Grammar," on "The Points and Marks made use of in Writing," he says: "You will see that it is quite impossible to give any *precise rules* for the use of these several points. Much must be left to taste:[1] something must depend upon the weight which we may wish to give to particular words, or phrases;[1] and something on the seriousness, or the levity, of the subject on which we are writing."

To practically the same effect Mr. W. P. Garrison wrote in the "Atlantic" some fifteen years ago: "The writer on the 'laws' of punctuation must begin by admitting that no two masters of the art would punctuate the same page in the same way; that usage varies with every printing-office and with every proof-reader; that as regards the author, too, his punctuation is largely determined by his style, or, in other words, is singular and individual — 'singular, and to the humor of his irregular self.' The same writer will tell you, further, that punctuation will vary according as one has in view rapidity and clearness of comprehension, avoidance of fatigue in reading aloud, or

[1] We may presume that he was governed by taste when he made use of this colon and semicolon in exactly parallel cases.

rhetorical expression. Worse still, coming to the conventional signs which we call points or stops, he is bound to acknowledge that they are very largely interchangeable, at the caprice of authors or printers. Well may he exclaim, with Robinson Crusoe, 'These considerations really put me to a pause, and to a kind of a full stop.'" [1]

The recent (1919) very elaborate work on "Modern Punctuation," by Mr. George Summey, Jr., of the North Carolina State College, seems to confirm in the fullest degree this theory of the inevitable *uncertainty* of punctuation. Mr. Summey quotes "a Harvard professor of English, the author of a well-known textbook on English Composition," as saying of punctuation, "I have never yet come across a book on the subject which did not leave me more puzzled than it found me"; and these words he accepts as an "invitation," as well as a warning. "Punctuation," he says, "ought to be understood, because it is bound up with the important social art of communication in writing. And it need be no more mysterious than harmony of tone or color — matters at least equally difficult, yet successfully reduced to useful theory."

The author of the present compilation is bound to confess that, after a rather careful reading of Mr. Summey's 250-odd pages, he laid the book

[1] *Atlantic*, August, 1906, p. 233.

down with a firmer conviction than ever of the impossibility of reducing punctuation to useful theory; for it seemed, and still seems, to him that the whole result of Mr. Summey's painstaking elucidation of the subject — in which the editorials in certain daily and weekly journals in the "hasty" years 1917 and 1918 seem to be treated as of equal weight with the writings of Walter Pater and Henry James in establishing what modern punctuation is — is to overcloud it in mystery; and that the one outstanding conclusion is that the authority of usage can be claimed for the employment of almost any punctuation mark for almost any purpose.

The writer once asked the advice of the late Horace E. Scudder, some time editor of the "Atlantic," as to the proper treatment of the punctuation of an early seventeenth-century "classic" of which he (the writer) was then engaged in overseeing a new edition, supposed to be a reproduction *verbatim ac litteratim* of the original. The work in question was itself a translation, whose "quaintness" has always been assumed to make amends for its failure to show comprehension of — or, at all events, adequately to interpret — the author's thought; and the so-called punctuation again and again made confusion worse confounded. Mr. Scudder's suggestion, that the main purpose of punctuation is *to assist the reader*, not only im-

mensely simplified the task then in hand, but has remained always in the present writer's mind as the basic principle of his work on the copy and proof-sheets of the "Atlantic" during the years that they have been principally in his charge.[1] For, as was said by the late Horace Hart, "Most writers send in copy quite unprepared as regards punctuation, and leave the compositor to put in the proper marks. 'Punctuation is an art nearly always left to the compositor, authors being almost without exception either too busy or too careless to regard it.' "[2]

It goes without saying that, in the case of a magazine of the character of the "Atlantic," there must be a certain uniformity — or, at least, a vigorous striving after uniformity — in the enforcement of certain hard-and-fast rules of punctuation applicable to all cases. Take, for instance, the matter of the use or omission of the comma before a connective joining the last two members of a series of adjectives, or nouns, or phrases, or what not: the practice varies, but Atlantic usage requires the use of the comma *in all cases*, unless

[1] Stops "are to be regarded as devices, not for saving [the author] the trouble of putting his words into the order that naturally gives the required meaning, but for saving his reader the moment or two that would sometimes, without them, be necessarily spent on reading the sentence twice over, once to catch the general arrangement, and again for the details." *The King's English*, p. 225.

[2] *Rules for Compositors and Readers*, etc., p. 56.

the last two members of the series are more closely connected in sense or construction than those that precede; so that the omission of the comma always implies such closer connection. One very satirical comment from a critical reader comes to mind, to the effect that persons of ordinary intelligence might have been assumed to be quite competent to work out for themselves, without the assistance of the comma, the fact that the last two members of a certain series were no more closely connected with each other than with the preceding members. One might say with equal force that it is unnecessary to use a question mark with a direct question, because anybody could tell from the form of the words that a question was asked; whereas the true reason for the use of that mark is to inform the reader that the sentence is interrogative, whatever the arrangement of the words. "Are you going out in this storm?" is unmistakably a question; but "You're not going out in this storm" may mean, "Do you really intend to go out?" or "I forbid you to go out!" according to the punctuation mark used to indicate the rhetorical effect.

Another invariable rule requires the omission of the period after Roman numerals, because they are no more abbreviations than are the Arabic symbols.[1] In accordance with what was formerly the universal practice, this period is still used in

[1] See p. 66 *infra.*

Great Britain, and in a few offices in this country; but in a magazine more or less used for educational purposes, it would be manifestly absurd to follow one rule in the majority of cases, and to allow the other form to stand now and then because it is found in the copy.

In what the authors of "The King's English" describe as the "formal periodic arrangement" of sentences, the four points, period, colon, semicolon, and comma, "form a series, each member of which directs us to pause for so many units of time before proceeding. There is essentially nothing but a quantitative time-relation between them. The first difficulty is that this simple distinction has to convey to the reader differences of more than one kind, and not commensurable; it has to do both logical and rhetorical work. Its logical work is helping to make clear the grammatical relations between parts of a sentence or paragraph and the whole or other parts; its rhetorical work is contributing to emphasis, heightening effect, and regulating pace. . . . The difference between these two: 'The master beat the scholar with a strap,' and 'The master beat the scholar, with a strap,' is in logic nothing; but in rhetoric it is the difference between matter-of-fact statement and indignant statement: a strap, we are to understand from the comma, is a barbarous instrument.

"It is true that modern printers make an effort to be guided by logic or grammar alone; it is impossible for them to succeed entirely; . . . the old stopping was frankly to guide the voice in reading aloud, while the modern is mainly to guide the mind in seeing through the grammatical construction.

"A perfect system of punctuation, then, that should be exact and uniform, would require separate rhetorical and logical notations in the first place. Such a system is not to be desired: the point is only that, without it, usage must fluctuate according as one element is allowed to interfere with the other. But a second difficulty remains, even if we assume that rhetoric could be eliminated altogether. Our stop series, as explained above, provides us with four degrees; but the degrees of closeness and remoteness between the members of sentence or paragraph are at the least ten times as many. It is easy to show that the comma, even in its purely logical function, has not one, but many tasks to do, which differ greatly in importance. . . . Similarly, the semicolon often separates grammatically complete sentences, but often also the mere items of a list, and between these extremes it marks other degrees of separation. A perfect system for the merely logical part of punctuation, then, would require some scores of stops instead of four. This again is not a thing

to be desired; how little, is clear from the fact that one of our scanty supply, the colon, is now practically disused as a member of the series, and turned on to useful work at certain little odd jobs." [1]

In connection with the "formal periodic arrangement" of sentences described in the foregoing quotation, this is, perhaps, a convenient place to refer to a rare little volume, called "Punctuation in Verse: or the Good Child's Book of Stops," by one Madame de Leinstein, of which there is a copy in the Children's Department of the New York Public Library; this copy, through the courtesy of Miss Annie Carroll Moore of that department, the writer was allowed to examine. It was printed in London, presumably a great many years ago, — it bears no date, — consists of only thirty-odd pages, of which one half are blanks, and is "Embellished with Twelve handsomely colored Engravings." The two couplets following (put in the mouth of "Cook Comma"), —

> At the Comma, each reader should stay, and count *one;*
> As, "Charles had an orange, a tart, and a bun."
>
> At each Semicolon, take breath and count *two;*
> As, "This is a Christian; that other, a Jew," —

with which the little book opens, confirm, as will be seen, Messrs. Fowlers' statement that "the old stopping was frankly to guide the voice in reading

[1] *The King's English*, pp. 220 *ff.*

aloud." But it is curious to observe that, by reversing these simple rules, we can measurably subserve the purpose of modern "stopping" — "to guide the mind in seeing through the grammatical construction."

For example, take Cook Comma's first example, "Charles had an orange, a tart, and a bun." To show how it should be read, with exactly the same pause after "tart" as after "orange," we put a comma after each word; whereas, in the sentence, "We have had all sorts of weather today: rain, snow, hail, sleet, thunder and lightning; but we can expect nothing better in this climate," we omit the comma after "thunder," to show that there should be no pause after it, because it and "lightning" are more closely connected than any other two atmospheric disturbances. That is to say, instead of bidding the reader "to stay and count one" when he sees a comma, and "two" when he sees a semicolon, modern rules in effect bid the writer to insert a comma when he wishes the reader to "stay and count one," and a semicolon when he wishes to indicate a slightly longer pause, as after "lightning" in the sentence above: a decidedly arbitrary distinction, of course, and capable of endless variations, but still not without value.

(Madame Leinstein's next "rule," —

For the Colon count *three* — for the Period *four*, —

is of more limited application, as the colon has been "practically disused as a member of the series," and as the "periodic" system is manifestly inapplicable to the period, with which it seems etymologically most closely connected.)

The passage quoted above from "The King's English" seems to show clearly the impossibility of setting down any fixed rules for semicolons and commas.[1] This being so, there is no disposition to thwart the author's wishes, so long as they can be definitely determined. But such determination is almost never possible — about that, there can be no question. The practically universal use of the typewriter, while of great advantage in most cases, — though by no means in all, — because of the greater legibility of the copy, is distinctly disadvantageous in that it so seldom has the benefit of *careful* revision by the author, whether he is, or is not, his own typist. The writer has no hesitation in saying that among all the hundreds of articles which he has "prepared" for the printer, there have not been half a dozen in which such matters as punctuation, capitalization, and the like have been handled with entire consistency throughout, even when there have been indications of revision by the author. Typists are

[1] We shall see, later, that, though the colon has been practically eliminated from this sort of problem, the dash has come in to complicate matters.

notoriously unreliable in such matters, — I am not referring, of course, to the trained commercial or professional variety, but to those who are likely to be employed by authors,[1] — whether from ignorance or from haste; and, as I have said, their work is often left unrevised and full of inconsistencies, to say nothing of errors.

Copy occasionally comes in with instructions to follow it exactly, as it has been "carefully prepared"; but not a single instance comes to mind where strict compliance with such instructions would not have resulted in certain blemishes with which the author would probably have been the first to find fault.

It should be said, also, that it is not possible in all cases to give the authors of "Atlantic" papers an opportunity to read proofs. Many of the papers come from across the ocean; and in the case of many others, there is likely to be so much need of haste in "making up" the magazine, that it is impossible to await the return of galley proofs, even when they are sent. So that it is almost always necessary, even apart from other considerations, to abide by the general usage of the magazine in the matter of punctuation; for the make-up of the forms cannot be disturbed except to make impor-

[1] A little book published by the Dennison Manufacturing Company gives a good idea of the care with which business typists are trained to write — with almost as close attention to matters usually connected with typography alone, as is demanded of compositors.

tant corrections in the *text*. Thus, in the case of the "Atlantic," it may be said that "punctuation is an art nearly always left," not to the compositor, but to the editorial department in the preparation of the copy, and to the proof-reader in overlooking both preparation and composition.

In preparing "Atlantic" copy for printing, then, as well as in reading the proofs, an attempt is made to keep constantly in mind, so far as punctuation is concerned, these two considerations: (1) that the proper function of the various points is to assist the reader; and (2) that the magazine is coming to be widely used in classes in English Composition.

The hopelessness (which Mr. Summey makes so clear) of attempting to formulate iron-bound rules for the internal punctuation of sentences, together with the desire, discussed more at length in the section on "Spacing and Syllabification," to produce a page unmarred by uneven spacing, excuses, it is believed, the assumption of a somewhat wide discretion in the method of pointing clauses which are plainly parenthetical, — whether with commas or dashes or parentheses, — so long as the sense is in no wise interfered with.

In the following sections an attempt is made to distinguish between those cases which demand the application of fixed rules, and those which are governed by the general principles of Atlantic usage

in the matter of punctuation, subject always to the fallibility and infirmities of editors of copy, compositors, and proof-readers.

In the discussion of the proper use of the colon, something is said of its peculiar employment by Charles Dickens, who, we may presume, was responsible, generally speaking, for the punctuation of his own works. Even if we did not know that John Ruskin was emphatically his own punctuator, we could readily assume it from such sentences as the following, in which the curious mixture of different points could hardly have been evolved from the brain of any compositor or proof-reader. It is taken from "Sesame and Lilies."[1]

A web more fair in the weaving, by Athena's shuttle; an armour, forged in diviner fire by Vulcanian force — a gold only to be mined in the sun's red heart, where he sets over the Delphian cliffs; deep-pictured tissue, impenetrable armour, potable gold! — the three great Angels of Conduct, Toil, and Thought, still calling to us," etc.

Speaking of "Lord" Timothy Dexter's famous expedient of bunching his points at the end of his book, for his readers "to pepper and salt as they chose," Mr. Garrison says, in the paper already quoted, "This ignoramus intimated two truths — one that punctuation is, to a large extent at least,

[1] See also another passage from the same work in the section on the "Dash," p. 139 *infra*.

a personal matter; the other that punctuation may be good without being scientific."[1] A less extensive, but more pointed, application of Lord Timothy's idea by Richard Brinsley Sheridan, is narrated by Mr. Hart, on the authority of George Augustus Sala.

"In the House of Commons Sheridan one day gave an opponent the lie direct. Called upon to apologize, the offender responded thus: 'Mr. Speaker I said the honourable member was a liar it is true and I am sorry for it.' Naturally the person concerned was not satisfied; and said so. 'Sir,' continued Mr. Sheridan, 'the honourable Member can interpret the terms of my statement according to his ability, and he can put punctuation marks where it pleases him.' "[2]

The Period

The chief use of the period, is, of course, to mark the end of a complete sentence.[3]

We do not undertake to discuss here when the

[1] *Atlantic*, April, 1906, pp. 238, 239.

[2] *Rules for Compositors and Readers*, etc., p. 57.

[3] It is impossible to define the word "sentence" in connection with the use of the period without laying one's self open to the charge, say, of reasoning in a circle, thus: the period is used to mark the close of a sentence, which is a grammatical division properly brought to a close by a period. The various clauses, separated by semicolons, or even by commas, of what is called a complex sentence, are often, and properly, spoken of as so many sentences in themselves; so we have tried to avoid the difficulty, for this purpose, by adopting the term "complete sentence."

sentence is so "complete" that the period is called for, but leave that question for inferential treatment in the sections on the colon and semicolon.

The period is used after abbreviations, except chemical symbols, the phrase "per cent," and certain other technical forms which appear infrequently in the "Atlantic," and as to which special instructions are always given.

The term "abbreviation," properly applied only to forms resulting from the omission of a letter or letters at the end of a word, is here intended to include contractions, in which letters are dropped from the middle of a word — as *advt.* In some offices, however, a certain distinction is made between the two, and the period is not used where the last letter of the whole word is retained — as *Dr*, *plf*, etc. Thus *MS.* (manuscript) takes a period, while *MSS* (manuscripts) and *Mr* do not. In the "Atlantic," contractions are printed with a period when the omitted letters are not replaced by an apostrophe, as *plf.*, *advt.*, etc.; but *pl'f*, *adv't*, etc.

It was formerly the universal practice, still followed by some printers, to use a period with Roman numerals, and with the technical forms denoting the format of books; but these are not, strictly speaking, abbreviations, and the period is now generally omitted.

Volume IV, George V, 8vo, 16mo, etc.

If an abbreviation ends a sentence, the period is not repeated; but all other punctuation marks are retained with the abbreviation period.

These great Roman writers: Virgil, Horace, Lucretius, and Catullus, all lived in the first century B.C.

The meeting was announced to begin at 4 P.M., but it was half an hour later when the speakers entered the hall.

Occasionally one has to do with an author who insists upon repeating the period when the abbreviation ends the sentence. If the conditions are such that his preference must be followed, the unhappy proof-reader, who marks the extra period on successive proofs, can count upon being criticized as a blunderer by everybody who has to handle the type or plates.

The period is set always *inside* quotation marks.[1] It is set inside the closing parenthesis or bracket when the parenthetical matter forms a complete independent sentence in itself; otherwise outside.

[1] For a discussion of the contrary English practice, it is worth while to consult the late Horace Hart's *Rules for Compositors and Readers*, etc., already referred to, pp. 64 *ff*. But the rule there laid down — "If an extract ends with a point, then let that point be included before the closing quotation mark; *but not otherwise*" — is, now, so far as the period is concerned, more honored in the breach than in the observance, even in England, although some of the leading periodicals there and a few printers of books still put the period *outside* the closing quotation mark. Mr. Hart, of course, is discussing the position of *all* punctuation marks ("points") with reference to "quotes."

Ellipsis Points

Three periods are used to indicate the omission of one or more words. If the sentence preceding the ellipsis ends with a period, that period is not included in the three omission points.[1]

Certain writers have a habit, more or less persistent, of using what Mr. Summey[2] calls "reinforcing suspension periods, — a row of dots, usually three, — to strengthen or modify a period, or other full stop. The period," he continues, "is a sign of completion; the period with suspension points following is made suspensive, with the suggestion that the reader is to think a moment about the preceding words, or to look forward with special interest. . . . The suspension periods are not likely to mark a distinct topical break; they are indefinite signs of meditation."

Experience with many hundreds of contributions to the "Atlantic" justifies a strong doubt as to the accuracy of Mr. Summey's ascription of this "device" to American writers in particular. Indeed, the only example he gives in this connection is taken from H. G. Wells.

These same "suspension periods" are used sometimes in the middle of a sentence, marking

[1] In most fonts of type, the period and the omission points differ slightly; but for the purposes of this book they can safely be treated as identical.

[2] *Modern Punctuation*, p. 59.

"preceding matter as unfinished, or left dangling for an instant, for special attention."[1] But there is, on the part of those writers who habitually use the "suspension periods" in either of the above positions, so marked a lack of uniformity of purpose in such use, — even by the same persons at different times,[2] — and their significance is therefore so vague and indeterminate, that it is the practice of the "Atlantic" to entrust all such functions to the dash, which, to quote Mr. Summey once more, is "the point nearest suspension periods in effect"; and to use the three periods solely as ellipsis (or omission) points. This rule may be suspended in compliance with the urgent desire of an author, even though the special significance which he attributes to the "suspension periods" may not be apparent to the reader.

The very few sporadic cases of the use of these points to set off a parenthetical clause that had fallen within the writer's experience seemed hardly worthy of notice. But in "The Brimming Cup," Dorothy Canfield's latest novel, they are so used, to the exclusion of dashes and parentheses, with a consistency that seems to indicate malice aforethought on the author's part. Here is an example: —

[1] *Modern Punctuation*, p. 183.

[2] In Sir Harry Johnston's *The Man Who Did the Right Thing*, they are used for all purposes, with an unsparing lavishness that defies analysis or comprehension.

It's absurd to think that business men . . . they're the flower of the nation, they're America's specialty, you know . . . can only find their opportunity for service to their fellow men by such haphazard contacts.

Speaking of ellipsis points, it should be said that some printing-offices use a full line of periods to indicate the omission of a complete paragraph or more, and three to mark a lesser omission. This distinction is not made in the "Atlantic," except in verse, where an omitted line or stanza is replaced by a line of periods.

The Colon

The main definition of "colon," as a mark of punctuation, in the "Century Dictionary," is — a point "used to mark a discontinuity of grammatical construction greater than that indicated by the semicolon and less than that indicated by the period." We have already referred, in the introduction to this chapter, to the inclusion of the colon as one of the four points in the "formal, periodic arrangement" of sentences, quoting the authors of "The King's English" to the effect that it has now, by almost universal consent, fallen into disuse as one of that series, and been "turned over to useful work at certain little odd jobs." Indeed, the definition quoted above is practically contradicted by the subdivisions that follow but have little relation to it.

"Many people continue to use it," — we are once more quoting from "The King's English," [1] — "but few, if we can trust our observation, with any nice regard to its value. Some think it a prettier or more impressive stop than the semicolon, and use it instead of that; some like variety, and use the two indifferently, or resort to one when they are tired of the other."

The truth of these remarks is constantly exemplified in "Atlantic" copy; and a consistent, if not always successful, effort is made to confine the colon to the specific duties to which it is now generally assigned.

The most frequent and most generally accepted formal uses of the colon are two.

(1) To introduce a direct quotation. In Atlantic usage, when the matter thus introduced begins a new paragraph, the colon is followed by a dash. (In the magazine, when the quotation is introduced by "said," or an equivalent word, a comma is used instead of a colon.)

If, however, some such phrase as "he said," or "he answered," is interpolated within the quotation, a period should be used before it.

After another selection by the band, Senator —— was introduced and spoke as follows: —

"My friends, it is the purpose of this meeting," etc.

[1] Page 263.

When quiet had been in a measure restored, the mayor advanced to the front of the platform, and addressed the huge audience in these words.

"Ladies and gentlemen," he began, "after the warmth of this greeting," etc.

"The colon and the dash have many functions in common," says Mr. Garrison. "Either may be used before a quoted passage — and so may the comma, but preferably before a short quotation."[1]

(2) After the formal address of a letter — thus: —

MESSRS. MARSHALL FIELD & CO.
GENTLEMEN: —[2]

The colon is used also before a formal list, or before statements or specifications introduced by a general statement, or by such words or phrases as "thus," "namely," "for example," "as follows," and the like. This rule is subject to many exceptions, a comma being sometimes preferred when the general style of the work is less formal, — as in lighter essays and stories, — and the dash being often a legitimate and useful substitute.

The remaining function to which the colon is assigned in the purposed practice of the "Atlan-

[1] *Atlantic*, August, 1906, p. 235.

[2] The above is the style adopted in Atlantic books. In the *Atlantic* itself, the ordinary style would be: —
GENTLEMEN, —

tic," while really akin to those already mentioned, is less easily defined. Perhaps the simplest statement which practically embodies the idea is that given by the oldest authority quoted in these pages, Cobbett's "English Grammar": —

"The colon is often used when the sense is complete, but when there is something still behind, which tends to make the sense fuller or clearer."

Cobbett, by the way, frequently violated his own rules, generally when he was more intent on cudgeling his political enemies than on his theme; as in this instance, where his own precepts demand a semicolon after "demonstrates."

> How destitute of judgment and of practical talent these persons have been in the capacity of statesmen and of legislators, the present miserable and perilous state of England amply demonstrates: and I am now about to show you, that they are equally destitute in the capacity of writers.

In the manual by Mr. Horace Hart heretofore cited, it is said that "the colon marks an abrupt pause before a further but connected statement."

"The colon," says Mr. Summey,[1] "is usually an equality mark, with emphasis mainly on the explanation, quotation, or other following matter. Though still used by some writers as a compounding point, no more anticipatory than the semicolon, it is most often a mark of anticipa-

[1] *Modern Punctuation*, p. 192.

tion, introducing an extract, a list, or matter of any sort for which definite preparation has been made."

And, according to the Messrs. Fowler, two of the "odd jobs" are (4) "introducing a sentence that comes as fulfilment of a promise expressed or implied in the previous sentence; (5) introducing an explanation or proof that is not connected with the previous sentence by 'for' or the like." [1]

These various definitions (which may be taken to include such specific instances as the use of this point "before a series of details in apposition with some general term, as, 'Three nations adopted this law: France, England, and Germany' "; and numerous others given by various textbooks, handbooks, and manuals) all come to about the same thing, and the following digest of them all was prepared for the guidance of compositors and readers on the "Atlantic": —

"The colon should be used when the preceding part of a sentence is complete in sense and construction, and the following part is a statement naturally arising from it or explaining it, and depending on it in sense, though not in construction." In the numerous examples that follow, the colon is correctly used according to this rule, the succeeding words being in each case an explanation or authentication of what precedes.

[1] *The King's English*, p. 263.

The cry of "no sentiment" is indeed a sinister thing, for it is a sure sign that the meanest sentiments are *de facto* in possession: the sentiments which set the world at variance with itself, the sentiments which prompt contemptible actions, the sentiments which drive men and nations to sell their souls. — L. P. JACKS.[1]

The room was well furnished for a hut: besides the bed and the table there was a writing-desk, etc.

Suppose, for example, that a nation declares war on any member of the League: under the delegated form, the representative body would meet, etc.

The laughter and the talking ceased abruptly. I glanced about: every flower had disappeared, every head was bent.

Tuira had risen and was pulling at my sleeve: the meal was ready.

There was a great deal to do next morning: gifts to select and present, luggage to be packed and stowed aboard the boat, and a long session of farewells.

I claim that there is only one Art: that the picture, the poem, the sonata, the statue, the cathedral, are expressions of the same spiritual ideals through different media.

Nor can he create them once, and forever after contain them: each time that they are before him, they must be created afresh.

France has reaped from [the Revolution] one fruit, the natural and legitimate fruit, though not precisely the grand fruit she expected: she is the country in Europe where the people is most alive. — ARNOLD.

[1] For the use of *which* in this sentence, see p. 218 *infra*.

That is what I call living by ideas: when one side of a question has long had your earnest support, when all your feelings are engaged, when you hear all round you no language but one, when your party talks this language like a steam-engine and can imagine no other — still to be able to think, still to be irresistibly carried, if so it be, by the current of thought to the opposite side of the question, and, like Balaam, to be unable to speak anything *but what the Lord has put in your mouth.* — ARNOLD.

And a container is both inert and indifferent: a pig idly accepts anything; a tool-chest takes no active part to receive its tools. — HUXLEY.

Leaving aside for the moment the question of the proper assignment of responsibility for punctuation between author and printer (or proofreader), it is probably safe to assume that the very peculiar use of the colon by Charles Dickens, noticeable in all editions of his works from the beginning, is chargeable to him alone.

Mr. Tupman thought of the widow at Rochester: and his mind was troubled. — *Pickwick Papers.*

The echoes caught it up, the owls hooted as it flew upon the breeze, the nightingale was silent and hid herself among the thickest boughs: it seemed to goad and urge the angry fire, and lash it into madness; everything was steeped in one prevailing red; the glow was everywhere; nature was drenched in blood: still the remorseless crying of that awful voice — the Bell, the Bell. — *Barnaby Rudge.*

Mr. Jingle fell on his knees, remained thereupon for five minutes thereafter: and rose the accepted lover of the spinster aunt: conditionally upon Tupman's perjury being made clear and manifest. — *Pickwick Papers.*

In the next example, from another source, a semicolon would ordinarily be used instead of the first colon, and a dash instead of the second.

To what passes with the anchored vermin we have little clue: doubtless they have their joys and sorrows; their delights and killing agonies: it appears not how. — R. L. Stevenson.

In the occasional use of colons to enclose a parenthetical clause, as in the first of the following examples, Dickens does not stand entirely alone among English writers, as is shown by the second, taken from a recent novel; but no such use is recommended as authorized by good usage in any work on punctuation that has come under the writer's eye.

As he sat down by the old man's side, two tears: not tears like those by which recording angels blot their entries out, but drops so precious that they use them for their ink: stole down his cheek. — *Martin Chuzzlewit.*

So was the keeper: Macpherson by name: and more of a brother than any — an elder brother — was John.

There seems to be so little justification for the peculiar use of the colon in the next passage, also

from a recent novel, that one is not inclined to hold the author responsible for anything more than careless proof-reading.

> She engaged Mrs. Adams to take her place, [a semicolon is indicated here] and although the parlour-maid took offence and cut the painter of domestic service, went off to the munitions till Sergeant Frederick Summer should get leave to come home and marry her; and they were obliged to engage another parlour-maid in her place at double the wages: Mrs. Rossiter had done a very wise thing.

The colon is always placed *outside* quotation marks, as it is generally quite impossible to follow the rule, sometimes laid down, that it should be inside or outside according as it is, or is not, "part of the quotation." In most cases it is used in relation to the whole sentence.

The Semicolon

"The semicolon is now become a big brother of the comma," says Mr. Garrison,[1] "enabling long sentences to be subdivided with great advantage to comprehension and oral delivery." This may be recommended as a general statement of the chief employment of the semicolon, it being simpler than, yet quite as intelligible and satisfactory as, most of the rules to be found in handbooks and manuals. For, after all, consideration of "ad-

[1] *Atlantic*, August, 1906, p. 238.

vantage to comprehension" — in other words, of assistance to the reader — assumes greater importance in the matter of the use of semicolons and commas than anywhere else.

A study of the various attempts to formulate rules in this behalf discloses much repetition and much inconsistency. (In a number of works one finds no other assistance than something like this: "The semicolon is used in sentences like the following.") As a simple skeleton, which, although sadly lacking in definiteness, may serve in a measure as a guide to the general principle involved, this formula is suggested: —

The semicolon is used to separate sentences between which there is a more distinct break than is usually indicated by a comma, but which are too closely connected to be printed as separate sentences.[1]

In other words, — paraphrasing Madame de Leinstein's rule in "The Good Child's Book of Stops": "At each semicolon take breath and count two," — when one should pause long enough to count two, use a semicolon instead of a comma.

Something of the artist's soul must go to the making of the thing created; and as the artist . . . has to earn his living, etc. — W. J. Locke.

[1] Or, as Cobbett puts it (*English Grammar*, ed. 1906, p. 77), "The semicolon is used to set off, or divide, simple sentences, in cases where the comma is not quite enough to keep the simple sentences sufficiently distinct."

All this in Balzac's hands becomes an organic whole; it moves together; it has a pervasive life; the blood circulates through it; its parts are connected by luminous arteries. — H. JAMES.

It would be difficult to rebut a charge that the formula suggested above contains a rather flagrant specimen of the classic fallacy, *petitio principii*, in assuming that the distinctness, or lack of distinctness, of the break "usually indicated by a comma," and the degree of connection which is too close to permit separate sentences, are definitely established facts; whereas they are likely to be defined differently by different writers in innumerable cases. All of which means simply that, generally speaking, each case must be dealt with on its own merits, unless an author has definite ideas and indicates them clearly, in which case they will ordinarily be followed, even if they seem to be at variance with Atlantic usage, especially if they have to do with the author's distinctive style, or are intended to serve a special rhetorical purpose. For example, Anne Douglas Sedgwick, in her later stories at least, separates by periods sentences that might properly be separated by semicolons only.[1]

She, too, then grew very pale. It was as he had foreseen. She had not really believed. It had only been a

[1] See *The King's English*, pp. 220 *ff.*, for a discussion of "the spot-plague — the tendency to make full stops do all the work."

haunting dream. And her hope had been that to him, too, it was only a dream. Poor child! Poor, poor child! And poor Malcolm.

The following "rules," laid down in the "Manual of Style" issued by the University of Chicago Press, are quoted here as a striking proof of the confusion in which this subject is enveloped.

1. "A semicolon is used to mark the division of a sentence somewhat more independent than that marked by a comma."

One would naturally think at first glance that "independent" referred to "sentence"; but it is a "division" that the semicolon is said to "mark," so that "that marked by a comma" must mean that "division"; hence it is "the division of a sentence" that is "more independent" — a manifest absurdity.

2. "In enumerations use a semicolon between the different links *if these consist of more than a few words connected* [italics ours], and especially if individual clauses contain any punctuation mark of less value than a period, or an exclamation or interrogation point (*unless enclosed in parentheses*) [italics ours], yet are intimately joined one with the other, and all with the sentence or clause leading up to them, for instance, through dependence upon a conjunction like that preceding them."

Aside from the question of clarity of language in

this rule, it is interesting to note that, in the first illustrative example under this head, three of the "links" consist of one word, one of two words, and one of three; and although there is an individual clause containing punctuation of less value than a period, *it is enclosed in parentheses;* so that no part of the rule is applicable.

The following sentences are good examples of the correct use of semicolons.

It is right that a false Latin quantity should excite a smile in the House of Commons; but it is wrong that a false English quantity should *not* excite a frown there. — RUSKIN.

We find such a perfume in Shakespeare; we find it, in spite of his so-called cynicism, in Thackeray; we find it, potently, in George Eliot, in George Sand, in Turgenieff. — H. JAMES.

When you think that we dress in black ourselves, and put our fellow-creatures in green, pink, or canary-colored breeches; that we order them to plaster their hair with flour, having brushed that nonsense out of our own heads some fifty years ago; that some of the most genteel and stately among us cause the men who drive their carriages to put on little Albino wigs, and sit behind great nosegays, etc. — THACKERAY.

But some day, when experience shall have winnowed you with her wing; when the illusions and hopes of youth alike are faded; when eternal principles of order are more to you than sensations that pass in a day, however exciting; when friends that know you and your roots and deviations are more satisfactory, how-

ever humdrum and hoary they be, than the handsome recent acquaintances that[1] know nothing of you but the hour; when, in short, your being is mellowed, dulled, and harmonized by time so as to be a grave, wise, deep, and discerning moral and intellectual unity (as mine is already from the height of my forty centuries!), etc.

And this characteristic passage of George Meredith, although merely an enumeration of the guests at a dinner-party, would be quite hopelessly involved without the semicolons.

Present at a dinner little indicating the last, were Whitmonby, in lively trim for shuffling, dealing, cutting, trumping, or drawing trumps; Westlake, polishing epigrams under his eyelids; Henry Wilmers, who timed an anecdote to strike as the passing hour without freezing the current; Sullivan Smith, smoked, cured, and ready to flavour; Percy Dacier, pleasant listener, measured speaker, and young Arthur Dacier, the neophyte of the hostess's training, of whom she had said to Emma, etc.

In the first of the two following passages from "Sesame and Lilies" the use of the colon, instead of a semicolon, is justified by no rule or usage that has come to the writer's notice; and in the second, while the first semicolon is the appropriate mark, the other usurps the place of a colon, the last clause being explanatory of the one immediately preceding.

[1] On this use of *that* for *who*, see p. 207 *infra*.

I put aside his [Scott's] merely romantic prose writings as of no value: and though the early romantic poetry is very beautiful, etc.

We find in all a quite infallible and inevitable sense of dignity and justice; a fearless, instant, and untiring sense of duty . . . and, finally, a patient wisdom of deeply restrained affection, which does infinitely more than protect its objects from momentary error; it gradually forms, animates, and exalts the characters, etc.

And in this, the semicolon should be placed after "county," and should be replaced by a comma after "another."

One view called to another; one hill to its fellow, half across the county, and since I could answer at no more trouble than the snapping forward of a lever, I let the county flow under my wheels. — KIPLING.

As to the misuse of the semicolon in this next quotation, the authors of "The King's English" say: "It looks as if Carlyle had thought it dull to have so many commas about; but the remedy was much worse than the dullness." [1]

Nay, do not the elements of all human virtues and all human vices; the passions at once of a Borgia and of a Luther, lie written, in stronger or fainter lines, in the consciousness of every individual bosom!

The rule generally laid down, that semicolons should be used to separate independent clauses or

[1] Page 257.

sentences that have commas or dashes within themselves,[1] is often a convenient guide; but it is by no means of universal application: in less formal matter, when the sense is not to be mistaken, commas are often sufficient, and give a lighter and freer touch. Strict enforcement of the rule would require a semicolon after "aloud" in the first of the next two examples, and after "house" in the second.

He belonged to the class of his countrymen who have a dungeon-vault for feelings that should not be suffered to cry aloud, and into this oubliette he cast them, letting them feed as they might, or perish.

He became a guest at her London house, and his report of the domesticity there, and notably of the house, pleased Lady Dunstane more than her husband's.

On the other hand, in the following, from a letter of William James, the semicolons were made necessary by the interpolation of the phrase "national . . . foremost."

I am against all big organizations as such, national ones first and foremost; against all big successes and big results; and in favor of the external forces of truth.

For the benefit of those who may like to go more deeply into the question when commas, and when semicolons, should be placed between gram-

[1] "When the sentence contains commas doing less important work than the one about which the question arises." *The King's English*, p. 257.

matically independent sentences ("sentences in the proper meaning of the word"), we quote the following from "The King's English," referring the reader, at the same time, to the numerous examples there given of the improper use of commas.

"Though independent sentences are regularly parted by at least a semicolon, there are large exceptions to the rule. . . . There are three conditions that may favor the reduction of the semicolon to a comma: (1) Those coördinating conjunctions which are most common tend, in the order of their commonness, to be humble, and to recognize a comma as sufficient for their dignity. The order may perhaps be given as: *and*, *or*, *but*, *so*, *nor*, *for;* conjunctions less common than these should scarcely ever be used with less than a semicolon; and many good writers would refuse to put a mere comma before *for*. (2) Shortness and lightness of the sentence joined on helps to lessen the need of a heavy stop. (3) Intimate connection in thought with the preceding sentence has the same effect."[1]

In a formal enumeration, independent clauses or sentences, especially if marked in order by letters or figures, should be separated by semicolons if compressed in a single paragraph; but if each is given a separate paragraph, the better practice is to use periods.

[1] Pages 255, 256.

The procession entered the Senate Chamber in the following order: the President, who took his seat on the Vice-President's right hand; the Justices of the Supreme Court; the members of the Cabinet; the members of the House of Representatives, headed by the Speaker, military and naval officers in order of rank; invited guests.

The subjects to be discussed are three in number: —

(1) The desirability of a league of nations.

(2) The adequacy or inadequacy of the proposed League, as its duties and powers are defined in the Covenant that forms part of the treaty.

(3) The form of the "reservations," if any, which should be made part of the resolution of ratification.

The combination of semicolon and dash was formerly used with much greater frequency than now — sometimes where the best modern usage calls for the colon; as in this passage from "The Scarlet Letter": —

Here, it is true, were none of the appliances which popular merriment would so readily have found in the England of Elizabeth's time, or that of James; — no rude shows of a theatrical kind; or[1] minstrel, with harp and legendary ballads, nor[1] gleeman, with an ape dancing to his music.

One needs only to glance through the works of Ruskin, Emerson, and scores of other writers of eminence of a half-century ago, to appreciate the free use of this combination and the impossibility of attributing to it any special or definite

[1] As to this use of *or* and *nor*, see p. 235 *infra*.

significance. It is sometimes described as a "reinforced," or "strengthened" semicolon. It has long been falling into disuse, although it is by no means obsolete. But it is never used in the "Atlantic," and in Atlantic books only in reprinted matter.

At the end of quotations, the semicolon is *always* set outside the quotes, because in such circumstances it is almost invariably used in relation to the whole sentence. In any event, the frequent suggestion that it should be set inside the quotes, "if it is a part of the quotation," is practically impossible to follow, for obvious reasons.

NOTE. — Mr. Garrison, in the "Atlantic" paper so often quoted, gives this curious account of an early use of the semicolon: "In the days of the scribes, it shared with the colon a function now confined to the period, *viz.*, of denoting a terminal abbreviation — sometimes standing apart, as in *undiq ;* (for *undique*); sometimes closely attached to the final letter, as, *q;* for *que*. The early printers duly adopted this, with other conventions of the manuscripts. When the Gothic letter was abandoned for the Roman, a curious result ensued in the case of the abbreviation of *videlicet* (viz.). The semicolon was detached from the *i*, but no longer as a point. It took the shape of the letter it resembled in Gothic script, though not in Roman print, and thus really gave a twenty-seventh letter to our alphabet — a pseudo *z*. Not unnaturally, it acquired the sound of *z* or *ss*, as exemplified in the lines from 'Hudibras': —

> "That which so oft by sundry writers
> Has been applied t' almost all fighters,
> More justly may b' ascribed to this
> Than any other warrior, viz.

"Naturally, too, it ceased even to signify a contraction; for our printers follow it with a period (*viz.*) for that purpose; and if the practice observed by Goetz of Cologne, of using a zed for a period, had prevailed, we might have seen the odd form *vizz* arise."[1]

The Comma

The comma is by far the most frequently used mark of punctuation; it is much more likely to be overworked than underworked; and this tendency, being generally recognized, leads some writers to go to the other extreme and to follow rather too closely Mr. DeVinne's preference for the "open or easy system" over the "close or stiff system" in ordinary descriptive writing: (1) by the use of commas where semicolons would be of more assistance to the reader; [2] (2) by the omission of commas where the grammatical relation between words, phrases, and clauses cannot be properly indicated without them. There is a broad twilight zone where, so far as the sense is concerned, the use or omission of the comma makes no real difference, but is largely a matter of taste; and in such cases, the best modern practice undoubtedly inclines toward much greater economy in its use

[1] *Atlantic*, August, 1906, p. 237.

[2] It is difficult to draw a definite line, in this matter of the choice between comma and semicolon, and say how far it should be discussed under the one head or the other. For instance, the writer finds that he has quoted in the semicolon section the sentences immediately following the passage of *The King's English* quoted below.

than was customary until within, say, the last half-century.

The intricacy, when dealt with scientifically, of this apparently simple subject is illustrated by the following extract from "The King's English," under the heading: "The comma between independent sentences."

"Among the signs that more particularly betray the uneducated writer is inability to see when a comma is not a sufficient stop. Unfortunately little more can be done than to warn beginners that any serious slip here is much worse than they will probably suppose, and recommend them to observe the practice of good writers.

"It is roughly true that grammatically independent sentences should be parted by at least a semicolon; but in the first place there are very large exceptions to this; and secondly, the writer who really knows a grammatically independent sentence when he sees it is hardly in need of instruction; this must be our excuse here for entering into what may be thought too elementary an explanation. Let us take the second point first; it may be of some assistance to remark that a sentence joined to the previous one by a coördinating conjunction is grammatically independent, as well as one not joined to it at all. But the difference between a coördinating and a subordinating conjunction is itself, in English, rather fine.

Everyone can see that 'I will not try; it is dangerous' is two independent sentences — independent in grammar, though not in thought. But it is a harder saying that 'I will not try, for it is dangerous' is also two sentences, while 'I will not try, because it is dangerous' is one only. The reason is that 'for' coördinates, and 'because' subordinates; instead of giving lists . . . of the two kinds of conjunctions, we mention that a subordinating conjunction may be known from the other kind by its being possible to place it and its clause before the previous sentence instead of after, without destroying the sense: we can say, 'Because it is dangerous, I will not try,' but not, 'For it is dangerous, I will not try.' This test cannot always be applied in complicated sentences; simple ones must be constructed for testing the conjunction in question." [1]

The purpose of this book is more modest, and can be served, it is believed, so far as the comma is concerned, by giving a few rules which, while not perhaps to be followed absolutely in every instance, are of nearly universal application in the classes of cases to which they respectively refer.

1. The comma is used after a word or words of address or salutation at the beginning or end of a sentence, and both before and after such word, or words, within a sentence.

[1] *The King's English*, pp. 254, 255.

O Lord, have mercy upon us!

My lady Countess, suffer my page to kiss your hand.

Thy blessing on thy people, Lord!

And grant, O most merciful Father, for his sake.

Of course, Mrs. Warwick, it is not for me to hint at things that lawyers could say on this subject.

2. In a series, — whether of nouns, or of adjectives or adverbs used absolutely or modifying the same word, — a comma should be used after each member (except, usually, the last, when the series consists of modifying words, as in the last two examples below).

The United Kingdom comprises England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, of which England is usually called the predominant partner.

In nature, character, and intellect, he has no rival.

I think that you would like him, he is so tender, so gentle, and so mild, although fully as big as a calf.

The cross-examination was most searchingly, inexorably, almost cruelly conducted, to the utter discomfiture of the witness.

The God of heaven and earth loves active, modest, and kind people, and hates idle, proud, greedy, and cruel ones.

3. When the last two members of a series are connected by *and*, the comma should not be omitted before *and* unless those two are more closely related in sense to each other than to those that precede. In all the foregoing examples, the comma

is rightly retained, but it is rightly omitted in those that follow.

Bad health, a feeling of the purposelessness of his own particular existence, his philosophic doubts and his constant preoccupation with them — all these combined, etc.

The omission of the comma after "doubts" shows that his preoccupation was with them, and not with his health and the feeling of the purposelessness of his existence as well.

Zinovieff shot over five hundred of the bourgeoisie at a stroke — nobles, professors, officers, journalists, *men and women*.

Here, the omission of the comma after *men* means that the classes previously mentioned — nobles and the rest — were of both sexes.

On one side, elemental order, *sandstone and granite*, rock-ledges, peat-bog, forest, *sea and shore*, and, on the other part, thought, the spirit which composes and decomposes nature — here they were, side by side, god and devil, mind and matter, king and conspirator, . . . riding peacefully together in the eye and brain of every man. — EMERSON.

When all the members of a series are connected by *and*, *or*, or *nor*, no commas are required between them.

He was a learned and wise and upright man.

I can't remember who told me — whether it was Smith or Brown or Jones or Robinson.

Here little coyote was, without any house or clothes or book or anything.

In him there abode neither faith nor hope nor charity — to any appreciable extent.

If commas are used in such cases, it is always for greater emphasis or impressiveness — that is, for a rhetorical, not a logical, purpose.

There is Concord, and Lexington, and Bunker Hill, and there they will remain forever.

Neither the Court, nor society, nor Parliament, nor the older men in the army have yet recognized the fundamental truths, etc.

There was nothing in his career to distinguish him above the common herd: neither his intellect, nor his learning, nor his industry, nor his record of achievement.

And let me tell him further, as my lord will tell you, gentlemen, that a counsel, in the discharge of his duty to his client, is neither to be intimidated, nor bullied, nor put down; and that any attempt to do either the one or the other, or the first, or the last, will recoil on the head of the attempter, be he plaintiff, or be he defendant, be his name Pickwick, or Noakes, or Stokes, or Stiles, or Brown, or Thompson.

A comma should always be used before *&c.* or *etc.*, at the end of a series, or of an unfinished quotation; but the use of these abbreviations, except in quoted matter or in footnotes, is avoided in the "Atlantic."

4. When a series of adjectives, without connective, precedes a noun, all the members should be separated by commas unless the last one is more closely related to the noun, so that the earlier ones modify the two together; in which case the comma is omitted before the last adjective.

But hope only; for this instinctive, reckless virtue cannot last.

Instinctive and *reckless* both modify "virtue."

. . . any foreign city in which the spread of your presence is not marked . . . by a consuming white leprosy of new hotels and perfumers' shops.

Consuming modifies "white leprosy."

Here little coyote was, with his big furry ears, and his clean white teeth, and his joyful, cheerful little body.

Big modifies "furry ears," *clean* modifies "white teeth," and *joyful* and *cheerful* modify "little body."

The late Mr. Henry James, having, in his later books and in the revised versions of his earlier ones, found abundant employment for all the commas of which he could conscientiously make use, in pointing off the numerous parenthetical and quasi-parenthetical clauses with which his sentences are so profusely besprinkled, disregarded in great measure the hitherto universally accepted rule for the use of commas between adjectives

modifying the same noun. But in this he has been followed, if at all, only timidly and half-heartedly, and it is believed that his practice in this respect is not to be regarded as authority. In the story called "Pandora" the following sentence occurs: —

He was a model character for such a purpose — serious civil ceremonious curious stiff.

As an instance of his later manner of overworking the comma in other directions, this passage from "The Princess Cassamassima" may serve. In the original version, a love-scene between the hero and a young woman is brought to a close thus: —

"My dear girl, you're a comfort," Hyacinthe added as they moved further.

In the revised version the following sentence is added: —

Soon after which, the protection afforded by the bole of a great tree being sufficiently convenient, he had, on a large look about them, passed his arm round her, and drawn her closer and closer — so close that, as they again passed together, he felt her yield, with a fine firmness, as it were, and with the full mass of her interest.

But Mr. James is almost outdone at this game by a very modern novelist, who writes: —

Aunt Selina, snatching at her own immunity, has also shared, by suggestion, with you, a new freedom, at once attainable.

5. Generally speaking, the comma is used between the separate but closely connected elements of a sentence.[1]

His ears and face are black, his eyes are yellow, his paws are magnificent, his tail keeps wagging all the time, and he makes on me the impression, etc. — WILLIAM JAMES.

That so they might keep their mountain waters pure, their mountain paths peaceful, and their traditions of domestic life holy.

6. A comma should generally be placed before *not*, or *not only*, *not merely*, *not simply*, and the like, introducing an antithetical clause, and before the corresponding correlative *but*, *but also*, etc. But the application of this rule sometimes leads to an unpleasant degree of stiffness, and it is subject to many exceptions, which it is impossible to classify. In the examples that follow it will be noted that the comma, when it is used before *not*, always means that we naturally pause at least long enough to "count one."

The Puritan hated bear-baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators. — MACAULAY.

[1] It is sometimes difficult to draw the line between this rule and those relating to the members of a series (numbers 2 and 3 above).

These instances are presented, not to belittle the power of the United States, but to make clear, etc.

And after all, justice consists, not in correcting or punishing past injustice, but in the constant and perpetual desire to satisfy the reasonable wants of every man.

Whenever two of the talkers met at the same table, there was danger of an unedifying encounter, not so much of wits as of temper.

By faith you can move mountains; but the important thing is, not to move the mountains, but to have the faith.

Now it is a fad with some people to talk as if the war had not only made necessary, but made actual, a vast religious revival.

The Board, however, showed plainly that Colman was not only a sage, but a best-dresser.

If the correlative is omitted, the comma should ordinarily be omitted before *not*, etc., and a semicolon be placed at the end of the *not* clause.

The significant thing is not that those brought before them are not treated as criminals; it is that their delinquencies, etc.

If we substitute "but" for "it is," a comma should be inserted before the first *not*, and the semicolon be changed to a comma.

7. A comma should be used when the subject changes, even if there are but two clauses, and they are joined by *and*, unless they are very closely connected in thought; generally, also, when the

voice or mood changes, though the subject remains the same.

The banished of Eden had to put on metaphors, and the common use of them has helped largely to civilize us.

Her hat was suited for all weathers, and she had made it herself.

She determined to learn riding, and was forced to admit that the exercise was too strenuous for her.

In the following example, the comma is properly omitted between the first two clauses, and inserted before the third.

He was the man and she was the woman, and the world was a Garden of Eden, conjured up by the power of passion.

8. A comma is required both before and after an explanatory word or phrase within a sentence; that is to say, between words, or a word and a phrase, in apposition.

Most of the white inhabitants were Scots merchants, men who had monopolized Virginia business before the Revolution, lost all their gains, . . . and returned happily for more.

A colon after "merchants" would be logical, but too stiff and formal; according to modern practice, a dash would be an acceptable alternative.

The great Whig general, Churchill, with his wife, exerted a controlling influence over the Queen's mind.

The question, "Shall the resolution of ratification pass?" was put amid intense, but controlled, excitement.

So that, in all cases, with Scott as with Shakespeare, it is the woman who watches over, teaches, and guides the youth. — RUSKIN.

9. A comma should generally be placed after the following words and phrases at the beginning of a sentence, either suggesting a relation to what has gone before, or referring, in a general sense, to what follows. The same and similar words and phrases should be set off by commas when they occur in the middle of a sentence.

Again (not relating to time)
Besides (object omitted)
Finally
First (firstly)
Further (furthermore)
However
Indeed
Meanwhile
Moreover
Naturally
Nay
Now (not relating to time)
Perhaps (perchance, peradventure, mayhap)
Secondly, thirdly, etc.
Therefore
Well
Wherefore (not interrogative)
Why (not interrogative)

After all
At any rate (in any case, at all events)
At last
At least
For instance (for example)
In the first place, etc.
In the meantime
Of course
On the one hand
On the other hand (on the contrary)
That is (that is to say)
To be sure

These lists are by no means exhaustive. Moreover, one should be careful to make sure of the sense in which the word or phrase in question is used. "The [proof-]reader is not to be commended, who, being told that the word however was usually followed by a comma, insisted upon altering a sentence beginning 'However true this may be,' etc., to 'However, true this may be.' "[1]

Besides, the decision of Judge ——, of the United States District Court of Connecticut, will, if affirmed by the Supreme Court, cost the government hundreds of millions of dollars.

Finally, even words that have not begun to be naturalized may be used exceptionally, when a real point can be gained by it.

Further, it may be said with even greater force that the whole business is bad politics as well as bad morals.

Secondly, it is a sound principle that as few stops should be used as will do the work.

Meanwhile, the feet of the couple were going faster than their heads to the end of their journey.

Why, no such outrageous scheme was ever put forward before!

It is, at any rate, defensible under these circumstances.

Of course, anyone can imagine a condition of affairs in which such repressive measures, or much more repressive ones, might be justified.[2]

[1] Hart, *Rules for Compositors and Readers*, etc., p. 58 *n.*

[2] "Of course" does not require a comma in such simple constructions as: "Did you go to your father's study as you were told?" "Of course I did."

Perhaps, after all, the Redworths of the world were right. — MEREDITH.

The first thing, therefore, that a bishop has to do is, at least, to put himself in a position in which, at any moment, he can obtain the history, etc. — RUSKIN.

Nay, I will go further and confess, since here if anywhere we are candid, etc. — LOWES DICKINSON.

Perhaps, however, before proceeding to analyze the spiritual ideals of the American people, I had better give some idea of their country. — LOWES DICKINSON.

No one, to begin with, is more conscious than a true socialist of the importance of science.

Gautier's death, indeed, in the nature of things could not but be touching and dispose one to large allowances.

Well, now, assuming this standpoint, let us go on to see how some of the questions look which have been touched upon.

10. Participial clauses at the beginning of a sentence should be followed by a comma.

Having reached this point in the ascent, he turned to look back.

Thinking over his abrupt retirement from the crowded circle, Diana felt her position pinch her.

11. In general, a comma should follow any clause placed at the beginning of a sentence out of its natural order, for emphasis, or to serve some other end.

Of such a rule, all men, dimly and at moments, are aware. — LOWES DICKINSON.

For people like myself, there is no longer a place in politics.

In "Romeo and Juliet," the wise and entirely brave stratagem of the wife is brought to ruinous issue by the reckless impatience of her husband. — RUSKIN.

Instead of trying to do this, you turn away from it.

This practice is carried to extremes by newspaper correspondents of the present day, in devising their so-called "leads" to attract attention at once to what they consider the most important feature of a "story." The examples that follow are found on two pages of a journal that happens to lie at the writer's hand.

Ignoring the state department's order of deportation, Secretary of Labor Wilson today granted Lord Mayor O'Callaghan of Cork, who arrived in Newport News last week without a passport, permission to land as a seaman.

Surprised at the failure of the Secretary of Labor to recognize the formal ruling of the state department, ordering deportation of Mr. O'Callaghan . . . Acting Secretary of State Davis announced tonight, etc.

Close on the heels of rumors that Police Commissioner Enright had offered his resignation to Mayor Hylan, subpoenas were served today on both officials, etc.

Although liquor, some of it good, but much of it bad, still is obtainable in large quantities, the head of the prohibition enforcement corps believes, etc.

Before an altar of ferns and roses, under an arch draped by the American flag, with extreme simplicity that even precluded music, Mme. Amelita Galli-Curci, coloratura soprano, and Homer Samuels, pianist and composer, her accompanist, were married at noon today at his home here.

12. A single comma should not stand between the subject and predicate, as in the sentences given below. In each of them the difficulty can be avoided by inserting a comma where the bracketed comma stands, before the subordinate modifying clause. But when this cannot logically be done, as, for instance, in the case of defining relative clauses, it is the better practice to omit the offending comma, although, under the designation of "suspensive comma," its use is insisted upon by some authors.

A few words [,] well chosen and well distinguished, will do work that a thousand cannot. — RUSKIN.

Also, a great nation [,] having made up its mind that hanging is quite the wholesomest process for its homicides in general, can yet with mercy distinguish between the degrees of guilt in homicide.

But always the artist [,] in launching a new work on the world, does offer for sale a part of that within him which we are bound to call his soul. — W. J. LOCKE.

Mr. Pickwick [,] with his hands in his pockets and his hat cocked completely over his left eye, was leaning against the dresser.

Therefore the creative power of poetry wanted [,] for success in the highest sense, materials and a basis.

In the next sentence the comma is hardly excusable; in the one from Emerson commas might conceivably be supplied before the two *withs;* but the result would be intolerably stiff and jerky, and it would be much better to omit those after "spirit" and "passion." Ruskin's punctuation is *sui generis* here, as often elsewhere.

Those of us whose memories go back twenty-five years or so, remember it as the medium of that great music-hall artist, Albert Chevalier.

But observe that from those who with deepest spirit, meditate, and with deepest passion, mourn. — EMERSON.

The elements that feed us, judge, as they minister — and the pleasures that deceive us, judge, as they indulge. — RUSKIN.

It is sometimes said that the comma may on occasion properly be used between subject and predicate "for the sake of clearness"; also that "it should always be used at the end of a long, modified subject"; but it would seem to be the more logical practice to use the comma only to avoid downright awkwardness or patent ambiguity. "The considerable length of the subject, it must be admitted, makes a comma comforting; it gives us a sort of assurance that we have kept our

hold on the sentence. It is illogical, however, and, owing to the importance of not dividing subject from verb, unpleasantly illogical." [1]

In the next two examples the subject and its verb are not divided, although the subject is in each case long and modified.

The very *fact* that the same word, "romantic," is used to designate the wonder of the infinite and the wonder of the limitless *shows* how early we merge together these extreme opposites. — P. E. More.

It should seem that a *party* whose theories are based on confidence in untrammeled human nature *ought* to present the aims . . . of mankind in a fairer light than its adversary. — P. E. More.

In each of the following the comma seems to be necessary: in the first two, to separate the *is's;* in the others, to obviate any, even momentary, hesitation as to the syntax of the words immediately preceding and following the comma. "Sometimes," says Mr. Garrison, "we must be willfully ungrammatical in order to be lucid." [2]

Whatever is, is right.

How irrational this dislike is, is proved both by logic and by the pleasure taken in this custom by the élite of mankind over here. — W. James.

[1] *The King's English*, p. 240. And see the examples given on that and the following page, from Swift, Huxley, Bryce, Emerson, Balfour, Leslie Stephen, and Morley.

[2] *Atlantic*, August, 1906, p. 239.

So the women who should, veiled themselves, and the others remained like pillars of stone.

Anything that impairs the welfare of the humblest mortal, is fatal to the moral welfare of the greatest.

The boy in "Pickwick" who secured the tight gold chain by butting with his head, alone had realized a short method with eloquent talkers.

The rise of such a society to such power as it now has, witnesses to profound modifications in the prevalent religious conceptions.

The comma between subject and verb is much more frequently justifiable when the subject is a phrase than when it is a noun, especially when the phrase ends with a word that may at first sight be mistaken for the subject of the verb.

That a clear conscience is still the best bedfellow, is the conclusion you have arrived at.

What the theoretical purpose may be, matters little.

How new was the idea, is illustrated by the fact that Lavoisier himself, was afterwards . . . led to call oxygen, the name by which it has since been known, "the principle which enters into combustion." — Sir M. Foster.

In the last example, the commas after "oxygen" and "known" are hardly strong enough, and should be replaced by dashes or parentheses.

It remains only to call attention to those cases of a comma between subject and verb for which there seems to be no justification unless it be some

undisclosed rhetorical motive in the mind of the author. Such motive can seldom, if ever, be sufficient to justify the confusion caused by the presence of the obtrusive mark.

A little hard-headed Ripstone-pippin-faced man, was conversing with a fat old gentleman. — DICKENS.

But the crew of the Bounty, mutinied against him, and set him half naked in an open boat. — BORROW.

Depreciation of him, fetched up at a stroke the glittering armies of her enthusiasm. — MEREDITH.[1]

Although Dickens was a confirmed sinner in this respect, it is questionable whether any writer of repute has ever been so addicted to this habit as Emerson. The following examples are taken from two of his essays.

A strong, astringent, bilious nature, has more truculent enemies than the slugs, etc.

The secret of the world is, the tie between persons and events.

A certain degree of progress from the extremes, is called Civilization.

And all that the primary power or spasm operates, is, still, vesicles, vesicles.

Another besetting peculiarity of the same author, namely, the use of a second comma between the verb "is" and its complementary subject, is thus commented upon by "The King's English":

[1] This and the preceding example are borrowed from *The King's English*, p. 239.

"Impressiveness is what is aimed at; it seems to us a tawdry device for giving one's sentence an *ex cathedra* air."

The reason why the world lacks unity, is, because man is disunited with himself.

The charm in Nelson's history, is, the unselfish greatness.

One more faggot of these adamantine bandages, is, the new science of statistics.

13. It is equally important that the *object* should not be separated by a single comma from the verb that governs it. In the first of the examples that follow, the comma is simply wrong; in the second, a comma after "carry" would justify the otherwise unjustifiable one after "nature"; in the third, the comma after "ideas," which separates "drew" from its object, "groups," not only is illogical, but leads one to think for the moment that "groups" and "usages" are members of a series of which "ideas" is the first member. In the fourth example, the comma after "within" is necessary, to stamp that word at once as an adverb, not a preposition governing "the peace."

It was noteworthy that he *took* from the lowest orders of creation, the *examples* upon which he based his demonstration.

It enables him to *carry* even into his observation of nature, a delicate *penetration*, etc.

In saying that the Encyclopædists began a political work, what is meant is that they *drew* into the light of new ideas, *groups* of institutions, usages, etc.

Art is no better able than nature permanently to *reëstablish* within, the *peace* that has been destroyed without.

When the object is placed before the verb, for any purpose (generally for emphasis), a comma between the two is often necessary, to avoid ambiguity.

This, man alone can *accomplish*.

. . . the buttons are lost, but the garments remain; the garment is lost, but the sitter remains; the sitter is lost, but the shadow remains; and *that*, night cannot *efface* from the printer's inspiration. — WHISTLER.

The *evil* diplomacy had wrought, publicity *was* to *cure*. *What* secret diplomacy had made possible, publicity *was to make imposible*. — STRUNSKY.

Shakespeare adhered to the rule (if he ever heard of it) of no comma between object and verb, when a modern writer would probably have disregarded it.

Thy own wish wish I thee. — *Love's Labor's Lost*.

14. One rule which, we believe, admits of no exception is this: that parenthetical, or quasi-parenthetical, or modifying clauses or phrases of any sort should be set off by commas *both before and after* (assuming, of course, that dashes or pa-

rentheses are not substituted for commas). As we have seen, illogical separation of subject and predicate can often be avoided by invoking this rule, which is, however, of much more extensive application.

Sometimes the sentence was never announced, but now and then, annoyed at his over-indulgent charity he allowed her impatience the privilege of speech. — S. WEIR MITCHELL.

The debate, which had commenced on the 13th of January, was protracted to the 3rd of February, when the question being taken on the first resolution, it was carried, etc. — IRVING.

Immediately after the appointment . . . despatches were sent to Mr. Monroe, communicating complaints which had been addressed to him, against the American government by Mr. De la Croix, etc. — IRVING.

In these examples, the sense absolutely requires commas after "charity," "when," and "government," respectively.

Sometimes commas are used by the best writers to set off parenthetical clauses for which dashes or parentheses would seem, for one reason or another, more appropriate. In these examples, the commas after "said" and "it" in the first, and after "purpose" and "future" in the second, might well be replaced by dashes.

Two or three Irish members came in much excitement to my table to know if the story of the letter was

true, and, above all, if Mr. Gladstone had really said, and really meant it, that he would withdraw from the leadership. — MORLEY.

It is of the last importance that English criticism should clearly discern what rules for its purpose, in order to avail itself of the field now opening to it, and to produce fruit for the future, it ought to take. — ARNOLD.

This rule is violated most commonly — notably by "that dignified class of writers which is supposed to, and in most respects does, insist on full logical stopping" [1] — where the conjunction *that* is followed by a parenthetical or modifying clause.

The usual mistake consists, either in omitting the comma after *that*, while one is placed at the end of the interpolated clause; as in

At a meeting of the Kent Chess Association he [Archbishop Davidson] remarked that though he was not a brilliant player, he could claim to represent all the pieces except the pawn. — A. G. GARDINER.

I told him that from the Irish point of view, anything was better than Irish Nationalists divided. — MORLEY.

or in placing the comma *before*, instead of after, *that*.

The chief criticism was, that having been the first to suggest the scheme, he had taken no steps to follow up his suggestion.

[1] *The King's English*, p. 249. The members of this class of writers who are there brought to book are Professor Huxley, John Richard Green, Mr. Balfour, and George Borrow.

In some cases the conjunction *that* is omitted and its place taken by a comma, as in

A learned physician tells us, the fact is invariable with the Neapolitans, etc. — EMERSON.[1]

15. The use or omission of a comma before a relative clause depends, generally speaking, upon the question whether the clause is non-defining or defining. "The function of the 'defining' relative clause is to limit the application of the antecedent."[2] The sense in such cases is best conveyed by making no pause after the antecedent; consequently no comma is required.

It must be understood that the word "defining" as here used has no reference to what we ordinarily understand by "definition"; as in the following sentence from Professor Huxley, the clause in which he defines "protoplasm" is a non-defining clause from our present standpoint.

In order to make the title of this discourse generally intelligible, I have translated the term "protoplasm," which is the scientific name of the substance of which I am speaking, by the words the physical basis of life.

"A non-defining clause gives independent comment, description, explanation, anything but limitation of the antecedent; it can always be rewritten,

[1] See p. 259 *infra*, for a further reference to this subject.

[2] *The King's English*, pp. 75, 76. Mr. Summey uses the terms "restrictive" and "non-restrictive" in much the same sense. See *Modern Punctuation*, p. 86.

either as a parenthesis or as a separate sentence; and this is true, however essential the clause may be to the point of the main statement." With non-defining clauses, a comma is required both before and after.

To determine to which category any particular clause belongs, a sure test in almost all cases is to remove it bodily and see if the sentence makes sense without it; if it does, the clause is non-defining; if not, it is defining.

This simple and easily applied test is really of immense value. We shall see later that the same distinction furnishes, in many cases, a useful guide in choosing between *that* and *which* as relatives.[1]

In the four examples that follow, the relative clauses are defining. In the first three the comma is rightly omitted before the relative pronoun; and for that reason it should be omitted in the second and third at the end of the relative clause, to avoid the separation of verb and subject. In the example from Ruskin some complication arises from the single dash, which should have a mate after "rightness"; as it stands, the comma before this second defining clause is necessary to show that "rightness" is not the antecedent.

I have never seen a man *who* looked less harassed, less tired and apathetic, more at ease with himself and the world. — A. G. GARDINER.

[1] See pp. 216–25 *infra*.

And . . . I have found that every detail *which* exactly matches my previous illusion of what Chiswick must and would be like, is either a spurious imitation, etc.

And this wide separation of those *who* died in one place and by one death, was constant, and a pitiable feature of the tragedy. — C. READE.

There are two passages of that poet *who* is distinguished, it seems to me, from all others — not by power, but by exquisite rightness, *which* point you to the source . . . of womanly beauty. — RUSKIN.

The following passage has two defining clauses, therefore no commas; but the same relative should be used in both places.

This is the attitude *that* has called forth an honest payment of federal income taxes by a nation *which* is justly notorious for its evasion of state and municipal taxation.

The first of the next examples has one defining and one non-defining clause. In the other two the relative clauses are both non-defining.

It is a spirit *that* contrasts strikingly with the spirit of France, *which*, now as ever, bears the banner of civilization. — A. G. GARDINER.

Anne, *who* had no will but that of the Churchills, had been induced by them to notify under her own hand to William, a week before, her approbation of the enterprise. — MACAULAY.

There is an indescribable fascination and triumph in sharing a secret with the wild-folk, *which* can be understood only by the initiate.

There are many varieties of modifying clause other than relative, which fall readily into the same categories of defining and non-defining. Of these, however, a very large proportion can easily be changed into the relative form. The same rule as to the use or non-use of commas applies with equal force to all.

The incident revealed the true workings of a type of mind so remote from the thought of our day as to be well-nigh incredible. — A. G. GARDINER.

The clause beginning "so remote" is a defining clause; hence no comma; equivalent to, "which is so remote," etc.

If Mr. Chaplin ever reads Carlyle, how his heart must be stirred by that moving passage [just quoted], probably the only one in all that turgid torrent that would be quite clear to his simple faith. — A. G. GARDINER.

The clause beginning "probably" is non-defining — equivalent to "which is probably." The clause beginning "that would" is a defining clause in relative form.

The most important reason for consistency in omitting the comma before a defining clause and inserting it before a non-defining one is that the meaning is often made clear thereby. To take a simple example: —

At the first meeting of the committee, which was held yesterday, the chairman announced, etc.

At the first meeting of the committee that was held yesterday, the chairman announced, etc.

In the first sentence the meeting referred to is the first of all the meetings of the society, the relative clause being simply explanatory, that is, non-defining. In the second sentence, by the omission of the comma the relative clause is made to *define* the meeting as the first of several that were held yesterday, without regard to whether others had been held before yesterday.[1]

One Charles Erhart . . . had beaten his wife . . . and was entrenched in the house with the black flag flying.

Without a comma after "house," the concluding words *define* the house as the one where the black flag was flying. If a comma is inserted, as it should be, the meaning is that he had entrenched himself in the house (presumably that in which he lived), and had (figuratively) hoisted the black flag; for there was, in fact, no such flag.

16. A comma is often used to indicate the omission of a word or words occurring earlier in the sentence.

[1] This distinction is recognized inferentially, but not in terms, in the *Manual of Style* issued by the University of Chicago Press, where the following is given as one of many illustrations of this rule, taken from the *Century Dictionary:* "The comma is 'used to indicate the smallest interruptions in continuity of thought or grammatical construction, the marking of which contributes to clearness.' 'The books which I have read I herewith return' (*i.e.*, I return those only which I have read); but: 'The books, which I have read, I herewith return' (*i.e.*, having read them all, I now return them)."

He had done something disgraceful, my dear. What, was not precisely known. — R. L. STEVENSON.

Ben Jonson was born about 1575 — where, is not known with certainty.[1]

To Anoano and No Food we gave a silk handkerchief each; to Amani, a pair of white canvas shoes; to Tamarua, an assortment of fishing tackle. — C. B. NORDHOFF.

17. There is a class of cases in which the final word or phrase of a sentence has, standing in the same grammatical relation to it, two or more words or phrases only one of which is in direct connection with it. There are so many possible variations of this sort of thing that several examples are given, in which the commas concerned are either printed in heavy type, or — when they do not occur in the original — set in brackets.

(*a*) We English, had we loved Switzerland, should have striven to elevate, but not to disturb, the simplicity of her people. — RUSKIN.

(*b*) Let us turn to one other, and, for this purpose, final, matter for post-mortem consideration.

(*c*) His mother was of gentle blood: Scots-Jacobite Keith on her father's, Randolph of Turkey Island on her mother's, side.

(*d*) All the great lawyers of the Revolutionary, and most of those of the Federalist, period, were trained, etc.

[1] It is interesting to note the different punctuation of the two main sentences here, the construction being apparently the same in both. The period after "my dear" seems less suited to the occasion than the dash in the second example.

(*e*) Many states are in alliance with, and under the protection of, France.

(*f*) To dazzle people more, he learned, or pretended to learn, the Spanish language.

(*g*) Apart from philosophical and sometimes from theological, studies.

(*h*) John Marshall inherited a taste for good literature, but was never in any sense a bookish, or even, in the usual sense [,] a cultured man.

(*i*) That indeed gave new life to the reverence which was becoming, or was closely allied with all that was becoming, a living principle in my character.

(*j*) It must have seemed to him that the examination of processes in the living body . . . was closely related, or at any rate that it might be related [,] in an enlightening way, to the philosophic pursuits that were beginning to invite him.

(*k*) . . . using the latter word to signify one whose philosophy authenticates, by guaranteeing the objective significance of, his most pleasurable feelings.

(*l*) I have at last "struck it rich" here in North Carolina, and am in the most peculiar, and one of the most poetic [,] places I have ever been in.[1]

(*m*) I am more different kinds of an ass, or rather I am (without ceasing to be different kinds) the same kind more often, than any living man.[2]

[1] As to the grammar in example (*l*), see page 232 *infra*, under the heading "Common Parts."

[2] In sections 152 and 153 of the University of Chicago *Manual of Style* are two rules which include a certain proportion of the cases under consideration, but do not, to the writer, seem exhaustive.

The question is as to the use or non-use of commas between the last of these "coördinate" words or phrases and the final word or phrase to which they are related. The authors of "The King's English" say that the comma should never be used if it is omitted after the earlier word or phrase; that it may often be dispensed with, even when the first one is necessary; and that both may be necessary if the phrases are long.

"Learners will be inclined to say: all this is very indefinite; do give us a clear rule that will apply to all cases. Such was the view with which, on a matter of even greater importance than punctuation, Procrustes identified himself; but it brought him to a bad end. The clear rule, Use all logical connectives, would give us: —

"He was born, in, or near, London, on December 24th, 1900.

"No one would write this who was not suffering from bad hypertrophy of the grammatical conscience. The clear rule, Use no commas in this sort of enumeration, would give: —

"If I have the queer ways you accuse me of, that is because but I should have thought a man of your perspicacity might have been expected to see that it was also why I live in a hermitage all by myself.

"No one would write this without both commas (after 'because' and 'why') who was not deeply

committed to an anti-comma crusade. Between the two extremes lie cases calling for various treatment; the ruling principle should be freedom within certain limits."

Whereupon, perhaps, the learner may repeat, with greater reason: "all this is very indefinite."

Applying the principles quoted from Messrs. Fowler so far as it is possible, we should say that in (*b*), (*c*), (*e*), (*l*), the second comma is not needed (it is found in some of them and omitted in some); that in (*a*) and (*f*) both commas are necessary, if either is used (else the first verb is separated from its object); that in (*d*), the commas after "Revolutionary" and "Federalist" both "belong," but the one after "period" is clearly wrong; that in (*g*), no commas are necessary — certainly not the single one, in its present position; that in (*h*), (*i*), (*j*), (*k*), (*m*), both commas are required.

18. The comma is never used with a single dash.[1]

In parenthetical clauses set off by dashes, it is used before each dash if it would be required at the break if the parenthetical clause were omitted — otherwise, with neither.[2]

The second carries us from 1625 to 1714, — less than a century, — yet the walls of the big hall, etc. — J. R. LOWELL.

[1] See p. 131 *infra*.

[2] See pp. 135, 136 *infra*.

I know Adam Bede well, — I know what he is as a workman, and what he has been as a son and brother, — and I am saying the simplest truth. — GEORGE ELIOT.

Garnet cites the case of a girl near Amiens possessed by three demons [,] — Mimi, Zozo, and Carapoulet, — in 1876. — J. R. LOWELL.

The fathers and founders of the Commonwealth — the statesman, the priest, and the soldier — deemed it a duty then to assume, etc. — HAWTHORNE.

Among his many idiosyncrasies of punctuation, Dickens had a way of using a dash where almost anybody else would have used a comma.

"Nay," said the eloquent Pickwickian — "I know it but too well."

19. The comma is never used *before* parentheses, and follows the closing parenthesis only when it would be required if the parenthetical clause were omitted.

The annual expenditure for public purposes (a third of it for military purposes), is at least 50 millions. — RUSKIN.

Probably Ruskin's fellow countrymen would be willing to forgive the superfluous comma, if the figures from which he recoiled two generations ago — "Sesame and Lilies" was published in 1864 — accurately represented the national outgo to-day.

The almost universal style of punctuation with parentheses until comparatively recent times was to put a comma before the first parenthesis and another at the end of the clause, *inside* the second. There was certainly no logic behind the custom, and it has been generally, though not altogether, abandoned.

20. A comma must always be used between two sets of figures.

Of the total casualties of 5283, 1472 are reported as killed, etc., June 27, 1920.

When he was no more than 25, 150 more men were put in his charge.

Also between the names of different persons, when its omission would mislead or cause ambiguity.

In his relations with Mary, Smith had never got beyond a certain stage.

21. A few formal uses of this point may be noticed, in addition to those mentioned at the beginning of the section.

In the "Atlantic," before direct quotations introduced by *said*, *replied*, *asked*, and similar words, whether or not the quoted matter begins a new paragraph. In the latter case, it is followed by a dash. In Atlantic books the comma is used only before short quotations that do not begin a new paragraph.

Of a study we are to ask, "Does it contribute to the doing of these things?" rather than, "Does the study make the child's mind more alert or sound or sane?"

Again, in the "Atlantic," the salutation of a letter is followed by comma and dash, on a separate line.

This tedious and protracted discussion, felt to be inadequate, of this vexed subject, may be closed by quoting some sentences which seem to show the futility of attempting to make rules to fit, even theoretically, all cases. The first two have been "put up" to the writer in recent "Atlantic" papers.

On some occasions we can best deal with ourselves from within out, on others from without in.

Through an unconscious application of Cook Comma's formula,[1] the sentence was punctuated thus: "from within, out; on others, from without, in."

Or must the horrid struggle of those who have not, to get, and of those who have, to keep, go on forever?

The following is printed just as it stands in the second edition of "Sesame and Lilies": —

. . . but how few kings have ever laid up treasures that needed no guarding — treasures of which, the more thieves there were, the better."

[1] See p. 59 *supra*.

The Dash

There are three forms of the dash in common use — the "en," the "em," and the "2-em," in the order of length. The em-dash alone is to be considered as a true punctuation mark. It is hereafter called the dash. The others can be dismissed in a very few words.

THE EN-DASH

The en-dash, which is half the length of the em-dash, may stand for the word "and" or "to" in such phrases as "the Radical–Unionist Coalition," "the Boston–Hartford Air Line";[1] "the period of Republican supremacy, 1860–84"; "pp. 224–30." It is necessary to be on one's guard against the use of the en-dash instead of "to," in connection with "from" — a surprisingly common error.

The Civil War lasted from 1861–'65.

This dash is used also instead of a hyphen in lines consisting of capital letters.

THE 2-EM DASH

The 2-em dash, sufficiently described by its name, has no other use in ordinary book-printing

[1] When one of the names in such a combination consists of two words, the use of the en-dash creates an awkwardness which it is better to avoid by using "and" or "to" instead. For instance, "the New York–Boston express" suggests a close connection between "York and Boston," but leaves "New" out in the cold. The "New York to (and) Boston express" is preferable.

than to represent a name not given, or the omitted letters of a name of which only the first letter, or the first and last letters, are given.

I met Mrs. S——, on her way to B——.

It is possible that I may see R——n to-day; if so, I will tell him that you are expecting him and J—— F—— to see him soon, to try to settle that old matter.

I must tell you that J—— writes me that he is sure that he has discovered the culprit, which is all you need to know, so that I will say simply that it is no less a person than ——. It is so necessary to preserve entire secrecy for the moment that I dare not write even the initial — even in a private letter.

This long dash is sometimes encountered where one would expect to find the ordinary dash; but the writer has never been able to discover any principle upon which such use is based, or any reason to refer the practice — in modern works, at least — to anything but indifference.

"Next to my wife, Diana Warwick's —— She'd send, never fear." — MEREDITH.

"Now, Charley dear," Peggy says, very seriously, "listen to what I have to say —— "

"I'm listening."

"Very well then. What I have to say is this — Yes. Sit still like that, and I'll ruffle your hair. That's right. Now about Miss Straker —— "

"Fire away!"

"If you can look me straight in the face, and say, really and truly I need n't be uneasy about you and her —— "

"Of course I can say that. Really and truly you need n't be uneasy ——. — DE MORGAN.

One would be inclined to say, perhaps, that Mr. DeMorgan, in this passage, reveals a purpose to use the long dash at the end of a sentence in conversation if it is in form or in thought incomplete. But on the preceding page of "Alice-for-Short," we find: —

"Because if this dear goose of a boy is going to sit listening to her by the hour together . . . ";

and two or three pages beyond —

"I know, Father," said he, "that what you wanted to know about was — "

The distinction is too subtle for the ordinary reader, who would, it seems to us, be quite as well enlightened as to the author's meaning, and quite as full of admiration for his genius, if the single dash had been consistently used in these and all similar cases.

THE DASH PROPER, OR EM-DASH

I. The dash has these formal uses: (*a*) With a comma or colon introducing quoted matter, *when such matter begins a new paragraph.* (*b*) With a colon, before any other matter properly introduced by that mark, when it begins a new paragraph. (In Atlantic usage, it is not used, in this connection, in the middle of a paragraph.) (*c*) In the

"Atlantic" with a comma, and in Atlantic books with a colon, after the salutation of a letter. (*d*) Before words (whether the name of a person, or the title of a book, or both) indicating the source of a quotation.

II. The other than formal uses of the single dash are: —

1. To mark an abrupt change of construction, or of thought, especially when a sentence is left unfinished.[1]

I declined to apply for it. I thought — But, Mr. Redworth, another thing concerning us all: I want, etc. — MEREDITH.

The white lock, whether he came by it by inheritance or by accident — what an ensign it was to blaze out the coming of the master! — G. BRADFORD.

Philammon, my son! and art thou too in league against — no, not against me; against thyself, poor misguided boy? — C. KINGSLEY.

There was n't another like her in the world, and it would never do if — But the if's were too hideous to contemplate, and Charles brushed them aside, etc. — DE MORGAN.

A succession of dashes may indicate a broken or disjointed line of thought, or a speech broken by emotion of one sort or another.

It was a suggestion — not definite — nothing stipulated. — MEREDITH.

[1] This would seem to be broad enough to include Messrs. Fowlers' "confessing an anacoluthon, or substituting a new construction for the one started with." See *The King's English*, p. 268.

Thanks be to God! But Philammon, if thou hadst had a sister — hush! And if — I only say if — . — C. KINGSLEY.

But to his astonishment, instead of the burst of bigoted indignation, which he had expected, Miriam answered in a low, confused, abstracted voice, —

"And did he send you hither? Well — that was more like what I used to fancy him. — A grand thought it is after all — a Jew the king of heaven and earth! — Well — I shall know soon — I loved him once — and perhaps — perhaps — ." — C. KINGSLEY.

A somewhat similar use is to indicate hesitation.

"Are they laughing because people do dance that way, or because they don't?"

"Because they don't — I think," my companion replied.

"I had — I had not a suspicion of doing harm, Percy." — MEREDITH.[1]

2. To introduce a summing up or explanation of, or a "preferable substitute" for, what has gone before; or to mark arrival at the principal sentence after a long or confused subordinate clause.

What does a man whose licentiousness controls his thoughts, and who knows it to be most odious in the

[1] It should be said that in these quotations from Meredith (*Diana of the Crossways*) and Charles Kingsley (*Hypatia*), the dashes in the text represent a confusing mixture, in the original, of dashes and ellipsis points (of the latter sometimes three and sometimes four) to which it is difficult to attribute any distinctive meaning.

divine sight — what does he say to God when he speaks of it to him?

To have faith in creation as it expresses itself in the instinctive demand of youth for education; to sit at the feet of childhood and to learn its ways; to use to the utmost, and to direct wisely, its resources of interest and desire — this is educational wisdom.

My poor girl writes of the hatefulness of having to act the complacent — put on her accustomed self. — MEREDITH.

Never to have come into contact with realities, never to have felt the pulse of things — that is what is wrong with Rosebery. — A. G. GARDINER.

The habit of snake and spider, the snap of the tiger and other leapers and bloody jumpers, the crackle of the bones of his prey in the coil of the anaconda — these are in the system, and our habits are like theirs. — EMERSON.

Is it just to construe the few world-view sentences of Jesus, not written by himself, written a generation after his death by those to whom these views were the colored medium through which they read all serious words upon man's destiny — is it just to put a meaning upon these sentences, etc. — G. A. GORDON.

3. For emphasis.[1]

The boys in the back are reduced immediately to graven images, with straining eyes and ears, all en-

[1] "Inviting the reader to pause and collect his forces against the shock of an unexpected word that is to close the sentence. It is generally, but not always, better to abstain from this device; the unexpected, if not drawn attention to, is often more effective because less theatrical." — *The King's English*, p. 267.

meshed in that finely woven fabric called — Literature. — E. YEOMANS.

He differs from the Heathen poet chiefly in this — that he recognizes, for deliverance, no gods nigh at hand; and that, by petty chance — by momentary folly — by broken messages — by fool's tyranny — or traitor's snare, the strongest and most righteous are brought to their ruin. — RUSKIN.

4. To introduce a list, or enumeration (here almost interchangeable with the colon).

Everything, naturally, is made to depend upon the action of the five leading powers — [*or* :] Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States.

Well, there is no accounting for the different roads that men take in their search after happiness — some keep the high road; some take short cuts; others strike out new paths for themselves; and others, again, permit themselves to be led on without asking the road. — *Adventures of Hajji Baba*, Morier's translation.

Some writers always use a comma with a single dash; some use it sometimes and omit it sometimes, alleging fine-drawn shades of difference between the two cases. So far as the writer has had experience with those of the latter class, it is almost just to say *quot homines, tot sententiæ.* As it is impossible to supply the reader with an explanation of the author's purpose in using the "reinforced dash" (or "reinforced comma"; the terms seem to be practically interchangeable),

the "Atlantic" always omits the comma with the single dash.

NOTE. — "Use the dash . . . after a comma, to increase the separation slightly," says Mr. Woolley in his very valuable "Handbook of Composition." Can anything be imagined more vague and illusory than such a suggestion, which seems to call for extending Cook Comma's "periodic rule" to infinity? "There may be arbitrary distinctions between the dash and the reinforced dash, but no such distinction is generally valid or clearly understood, except for a supposed difference in strength," says Mr. Summey ("Modern Punctuation," page 233). But is not the characterization of the difference in strength as "supposed" at odds with a clear understanding of the distinction?

"Is the dash to supersede stops at the place where it is inserted, or to be added to them? . . . Beadnell's answer . . . is: 'The dash does not dispense with the use of the ordinary points at the same time, when the grammatical construction of the sentence requires them.' But inasmuch as a dash implies some sort of break, irregular pause, or change of intention, it seems quite needless to insert the stop that would have been used if it had not been decided that a stop was inadequate. The dash is a confession that the stop will not do; then let the stop go." [1]

The following passage from "Sesame and Lilies" illustrates Ruskin's occasional use of semicolon and dash in conjunction, where the first would ordinarily be thought sufficient.

[1] *The King's English*, p. 269.

. . . shall abide for us Faith, no more to be assailed by temptation, no more to be defended by wrath and by fear; — shall abide with us Hope, no more to be quenched by the years that overwhelm, or made ashamed by the shadows that betray; — shall abide for us and with us the greatest of these; [:] the abiding will, the abiding name of our Father.

III. Dashes in pairs.

Dashes in pairs are being used with increasing frequency to set off parenthetical clauses, and the choice between dashes and parentheses in any particular case, with the exception noted below, is almost wholly a matter of individual taste. The dashes "furnish a medium between the light comma parentheses and the heavy bracket parentheses."[1]

Mr. Summey is able to suggest no better guide for making a choice than: "These [curves] are less frequently useful than commas or dashes for clause groups, but sometimes are useful. . . . Neither curves nor the other points are restricted to any particular type of parenthetical clause. Subordinate clauses or independent parenthetical clauses with or without conjunctions may be set off by commas, dashes, or curves. The more

[1] *The King's English*, p. 269. Messrs. Fowler use the term "bracket" to avoid the confusion between the common name of the curved symbols enclosing a parenthetical clause and the clause itself; and Mr. Summey uses "curves" to the same end. But "bracket" is the name ordinarily applied to the square symbols [ ], which have a wholly distinct use. See p. 145 *infra*.

nearly a part of the main structure, the less likely is a parenthesis to be set off with commas; the more distinctly apart from the main structure, the more likely to be set off with commas. But a general rule would be a delusion."[1]

As has been said already, in the "Atlantic" the choice between these alternatives is influenced more or less by the exigencies of spacing and syllabification; and these authorities seem to afford abundant justification of such eclecticism. Care must be taken, however, to guard against the tendency of some authors to use dashes where the connection in thought between the parenthetical clause and the main clause is so close that it would be annoyingly broken by any points stronger than commas; as in the first of these arrangements of virtually the same sentence.

The fog, which had been so dense as to shut off all view of the land for three days, finally cleared.

But

The fog — it had been so dense as to shut off . . . for three days — finally cleared.

And so

The preacher announced — no, sang — his text.

In the second and third examples, parentheses might as properly have been used as dashes.

[1] *Modern Punctuation*, p. 112.

Their peculiar glory — and it is very great — is that they demonstrated, in the face of apparent demonstration to the contrary, that a free church in a free state, etc.

The last example well illustrates the distinction pointed out above between clauses which should be set off by commas only, and those which, as Mr. Summey expresses it, are "more distinctly apart from the main structure." The first parenthesis belongs to the latter category, the second to the other.

He ascribed his scrupulous care in omitting any hint of Miss Straker — the good trying-on figure passed away down the street in his brain, but he said nothing about it — entirely to the fact that the bill before the House related entirely to Peggy, not to himself. — De Morgan.

As was said above, in connection with the use of the comma, that point is not used with either of the pair of dashes, if a comma would not be required in the absence of the parenthetical clause, as in all the preceding examples. On the other hand, a comma should be placed before each dash, if it would be required were the parenthetical clause omitted, as in the examples that follow.

I think, my dear Charles, — but I know I shall be set aside, — I should have a right to be told when Miss Straker is to be asked. — De Morgan.

Her murmur of welcome, her questions about his journey, her mild directions as she led him up to his room, — "Be careful at this landing, the level of the floor goes up and the beam comes down low," — were rather those of a shy and entirely unprofessional hostess. — A. D. SEDGWICK.

All the same, he was thankful when she rescued him from the woman who would talk to him idiotically about his poetry, — she evidently had n't understood a word of it, — and took him into the quiet nook near the piano. — A. D. SEDGWICK.

(This clause was set off between parentheses, not dashes, by the author, and affords another excellent example of their interchangeability.)[1]

The distinction is well illustrated by these examples, from Mr. P. E. More; in the first, the commas should have been used in conjunction with the dashes; in the second, they are rightly omitted.

Again, if you hear a man talking overmuch of brotherly love and that sort of thing — I do not mean the hypocrite, but the sincere humanitarian whom you and I have met and had dealings with and could name — if you hear such a man talking overmuch of serving his fellows, you are pretty sure that here is a man who will be slippery or dishonorable in his personal transactions.

[1] See the section on "Parentheses" (p. 143 *infra*) for the reason for the practice, long since adopted in the *Atlantic*, of choosing those marks in preference to dashes when the parenthetical passage is very long or when it includes a full stop.

But we have a sure monitor of the will to act righteously in the present feeling of happiness or misery, and we have a hope — a divine illusion it may be, for it has never among men been verified by experience — that in some way and at some time happiness and pleasure shall be completely reconciled by Nature.

It sometimes happens that the occurrence of other dashes in the same sentence may make it advisable to use parentheses to enclose a parenthetical clause. In the following passage from Arnold's "Function of Criticism," perhaps they might advantageously be substituted for the first two dashes. But it is a close question, and it seems that each case must be passed upon as it arises.

But surely the one thing wanting to make Wordsworth an even greater poet than he is, — his thought richer, and his influence of wider application, — was that he should have read more books — among them, no doubt, those of that Goethe whom he disparaged without reading him.

In "The King's English" there is an interesting discussion of the question how far the "authority" of the dash extends. It is far outside the scope of this book, and we can allow ourselves room for only a brief quotation from it. "There is no reason in the nature of things why we should not on the one hand be relieved of [authority] at the next stop, or on the other be subject to it till the para-

graph ends. The three following examples seem to go on the first hypothesis."

The first of the three examples, with the authors' comment on it, is: —

The Moral Nature, that Law of laws, whose revelations introduce greatness — yea, God himself, unto the open soul, is not explored. — EMERSON. (Substitute a dash for the comma after "himself." Here, however, Emerson expects us to terminate the authority at the right comma, rather than at the first that comes, making things worse.)

This discussion of the dash may perhaps be fittingly closed by quoting four passages — one of a clear misuse of dashes, with commas, for semicolons; the second and third are specimens of Ruskin's eccentric punctuation as exemplified in his use of dashes; and the last, a deliverance of Mr. Cobbett, which shows the development of the dash since his day.

But if there be a community which cannot stand any one of these tests, — a country where knowledge cannot be diffused without perils of mob law and statute-law, — where speech is not free, — where the post-office is violated, mail-boxes opened, and letters tampered with, — where public debts and private debts outside of the State are repudiated, — where liberty is attacked in the primary institution of social life, — where the position of the white woman is injuriously affected by the outlawry of the black woman, — where the arts, such as they have, are all imported, having no indigenous life, — where the laborer is not

secured in the earnings of his own hands, — where suffrage is not free and equal, — that country is, in all these respects, not civil, but barbarous. — EMERSON.

Only the first dash and the last are appropriately used: under numbers 4 and 2 respectively of the rules for the use of the single dash.

Then after agriculture, the art of kings, take the next head of human arts — Weaving; the art of queens, honored of all noble Heathen women, in the person of their virgin goddess — honored of all Hebrew women by the word of their wisest king — "She layeth her hands to the spindle." — RUSKIN.

Broidered robe, only to be rent — helm and sword, only to be dimmed; jewel and gold, only to be scattered — there have been three kinds of kings who have scattered these. — RUSKIN.

In concluding this letter, let me caution you against the use of what, by some, is called the *dash*. The dash is a stroke along the line; thus, "I am rich — I was poor — I shall be poor again." This is wild work indeed! Who is to know what is intended by the use of these *dashes?* Those who have thought proper, like Mr. Lindley Murray, to place *the dash* among the *grammatical* points, ought to give us some rule relative to its different longitudinal dimensions in different cases. The *inch*, the *three-quarter-inch*, the *half-inch*, the *quarter-inch;* these would be something determinate; but "*the dash*" without measure must be a most perilous thing for a young grammarian to handle. In short, "*the dash*" is a cover for ignorance as to the use of points, and it can serve no other purpose.[1]

[1] Cobbett, *English Grammar*, edition of 1906, p. 85.

The Hyphen

The hyphen is used between the component parts of a compound word, properly so-called;[1] also between the various elements of a compound word manufactured for the occasion. The letters of Professor James are rich in manufactured compounds.

The well-known and how-often-fondly-contemplated features tell the whole story in the photograph.

For some time past I have thought with longing . . . of the extraordinary, and in ordinary moments little appreciated, but sometimes-coming-across-you-and-striking-you-with-an-unexpected-sense-of-rich-privilege blessing of a mother's love (excuse my ancient German style).

If two or more compound words of which the second element is the same are connected by "and" or "or," that element is frequently omitted from the first compound; in which case the hyphen should be allowed to stand, to indicate the omission.

I left Keene this A.M., where I had three life-[giving] and health-giving weeks in the forest. — W. JAMES.

Mr. Summey is well advised when he says: "The hyphen is usually a nuisance in suspended expressions like *ten- or twenty-dollar notes*. It is

[1] This use of the hyphen is discussed in a separate section on "Compound Words," pp. 197–206.

clearly a nuisance when unnecessary to meaning or consistency."[1] It can almost always be avoided; even repetition of the second element is frequently less unpleasant. But there are times when its employment seems to be obligatory; as in, —

As "period furniture" these pieces are not a success, for they are not purely of any recognized type, not even early- or mid-Victorian.

But it is particularly obnoxious here, as "early Victorian" by itself would require no hyphen.

The only remaining use of the hyphen is to indicate that an incomplete word stands at the end of a line.

Parentheses

Parentheses (sometimes called curves, to avoid a possible confusion due to the fact that the same name is often given to parenthetical clauses, which may or may not be set off by the curved marks) have certain special uses.

1. To enclose letters or numerals marking the divisions and subdivisions of a subject. There is no universal practice in this regard, but the parentheses are much more frequently omitted with numerals, especially Roman numerals, than with letters.

2. To enclose the references for quotations or statements, if such references are embodied in the

[1] *Modern Punctuation*, p. 177.

text. But, except where they are merely incidental, it is much better to set them as footnotes. In the "Atlantic," where footnotes are used sparingly, if the source of a quotation is important, it is the more usual practice to say, for instance, "In the *Atlantic* for November last, Mr. —— describes in enthusiastic terms," than "In a recent number of the *Atlantic* (November, 1920), a contributor (Mr. ——) describes," or, "In a recent number . . . a contributor describes," sending the reader to a footnote for the reference. But sometimes, in this, as in other matters, we do violence to our own preferences.

3. To enclose an interpolated exclamation mark or question mark, inserted to express incredulity, doubt, irony, etc.[1]

So much for the special uses of the parentheses. They are used also to enclose parenthetical, or interpolated matter; but this function is shared with, if, indeed, it is not being monopolized by, dashes used in pairs. "The most frequent parenthetical points," says Mr. Summey, "are commas, with dashes second, and curves a distant third."[2] While this may be an accurate statement if we give the broadest possible signification to the term "parenthetical," — that it covers

[1] See in the sections treating of those marks, on pp. 148 and 151 respectively.

[2] *Modern Punctuation*, p. 107.

"everything that is adverbial," — it is, at all events, a much simpler matter to decide when commas are sufficient than, when commas are manifestly too weak, to choose between parentheses and dashes, if there is, in fact, any real choice. It may seem sometimes as if, in a certain case, parentheses were more appropriate — as, for example, in the following sentence; but we cannot derive from it a rule that a parenthetical clause in the form of a question should be set off by parentheses rather than by dashes.

His range of intellectual experience, his profound cultivation in literature, in science and in art (has there been in our generation a more cultivated man?), his absolutely unfettered and untrammeled mind, etc.

It may be said, however, that when the parenthetical clause is a long one, the parentheses are of more assistance to the reader than dashes, because the appearance of a single dash does not always indicate that another is coming, and its function in the particular case may be misunderstood; whereas, when one encounters the opening curve, one knows that the parenthesis must last until the closing one makes its appearance. The same argument may hold good even in a shorter parenthetical clause, if it includes a period and the beginning of a new sentence.[1] In the following

[1] See *The King's English*, p. 272.

sentence, from the works of Henry James, the interval between the dashes is so great that one may well feel uncertain as to the meaning of the first one. Incidentally, Mr. James's manipulation of the comma is well exemplified here.

I remember on one occasion arriving very late of a summer night, after an almost unbroken run from London, and the note of that approval — I was the only person alighting at the station below the hill of the little fortress city, under whose at once frowning and gaping gate I must have passed, in the warm darkness and the absolute stillness, very much after the felt fashion of a person of importance about to be enormously incarcerated — gives one, for preservation, thus belated, the pitch, as I may call it, at various times, though always at one season, of an almost systematised æsthetic use of the place.

Again, where, of two parenthetical clauses, both of which require to be set off by stronger marks than commas, one comes within the other, it is necessary, in order to avoid confusion, to use parentheses for one and dashes for the other, as in the following example: —

Of a hundred, nay, of a thousand or a million babies, — and though I cannot speak as a woman, it seems to me (except, perhaps, for a livelier interest and pleasure among them in their infant appearance) that everything I am saying applies equally to babies of that fascinating sex, — the trivial details observed by those who are nearest them are practically identical.

As parentheses are used, for better or worse, in this advertisement of a well-known financial institution of Boston, we offer it here as a riddle: can this sentence be punctuated; and if so, how?

1. Office hours from 9 A.M. to 4 P.M. Saturdays 9 A.M. to 1 P.M. The vaults will not be open for business Sundays, Holidays or Bunker Hill Day (the seventeenth of June, excepting when it comes on Sunday, when it will be the eighteenth).

Brackets

Brackets, sometimes called "square brackets," are used almost exclusively to surround something that is interpolated in quoted matter — something, that is, which is not a part of the quotation. For example, in the heading of a letter, if it is desirable to fix definitely the place, or date, at which it was written.

PARIS, *Sept.* 15 [1919].
[VIENNA] *May* 27, 1890.

They are often resorted to, to identify the person referred to by a pronoun, or to explain anything that is, presumably, explained in what precedes the passage quoted.

In the "Congressional Record" they are used to identify a Senator or Representative referred to by a speaker, but not named.

As the Senator from California [Mr. Johnson] said in his elaborate speech yesterday.

The Exclamation Mark

The exclamation mark is used after an interjection standing alone, also after interjaculatory phrases, including words of invocation, prayer, or entreaty.

"Ah! you've not seen her?"

Alas! alas! it was too late for repentance.

How long, O Lord!

God bless my soul!

"My poor dear countryman! and he thought me worthy, did he?"

Also after clauses or sentences expressing surprise, passion, admiration, or any strong emotion, or contempt, or irony. When such passages begin with "Oh," the better practice is to reserve the mark until the end.

"Habit be hanged!" cried Sir Luken.

"But not the last day — the last hour!" he pleaded.

As if he could be helped effectively by a shadow, or worthily by a slave!

> Oh, what a fall was there, my countrymen!
> Entomb'd within this vault a lawyer lies
> Who, Fame assureth us, was just and wise![1]

[1] This couplet is given in *The King's English* (p. 258), as an example of the single exception to the rule referred to below that this mark should be used only after "real exclamations": to express the writer's "incredulity or other feeling about what is not his own statement." In the epitaph quoted, "the exclamation mark is a neat and concise sneer at the legal profession."

The authors of "The King's English" seem to the writer to restrict the availability of this mark too much when they confine it to what they call "real exclamations"; and, on the other hand, to give it too great an extension when they include in that category "complete statements that contain an exclamatory word."[1] Although, in the example given by them ("What a piece of work is Man!"), the mark is properly used, such "exclamatory words" as *what*, *how*, and the like, frequently introduce such everyday expressions as "What a lovely day it is," and "How well Mr. So-and-So spoke," "How pretty Miss S—— looks to-night," all of which are "complete sentences"; and it seems to us that the use of the exclamation mark in such cases (very common in the works of some authors) tends to cheapen it and to weaken its force as an indication of genuine feeling of some sort.

"I read warily; and whenever I find the writing of a lady, the first thing I do is to cast my eye along her pages to see whether I am likely to be annoyed by the traps and spring-guns of interjections; and if I happen to espy them, I do not leap the paling."[2]

Although it seldom happens that any "sudden emotion of the mind" is expressed without some

[1] *The King's English*, p. 258.
[2] Walter Savage Landor, quoted, *ibid.*

"exclamatory word," the mark in question may, for rhetorical purposes, properly be used in the absence of any such word; unless, that is, we include in that category the numberless words that give emphasis to a statement.

He said it — yes, he actually said it!

Don't, I entreat you, take the risk!

Often, too, the exclamation point may be demanded by the use of italics.

His wife told him that it was hopeless, and still, still, *he did it!*

Generally speaking, the author is the best judge of the meaning to be given to passages not exclamatory in form, although apparently so in sense; and if the copy bears any evidence of careful preparation, the use or non-use of the mark in such cases should be left to him.

"The exclamation point . . . has a peculiar function in apostrophizing, and the poets avail themselves of it freely.

"O Lady! we receive but what we give." [1]

An interpolated exclamation mark, set between parentheses, — or between brackets in a direct quotation, — calls special attention, usually with a suggestion of dissent or sarcasm, to the word or words immediately preceding.

[1] *Atlantic*, August, 1906, p. 235. In this paper Mr. Garrison gives other examples showing the lack of uniformity among poets in the use of this point.

The honorable (!) gentleman has forgotten to state the terms upon which he accepted the office.

This use of the mark is probably too firmly established to be prohibited; but, although it does not deserve the sweeping condemnation of "The King's English," as "a confession of weakness and infallible sign of the prentice hand" (page 261), and as "a device of those pessimists who, regarding the reader's case as desperate, assist him with punctuation, italics, and the like" (page 216), it should be practised with restraint.

This mark is never used in immediate connection with the comma, semicolon, or colon; it may be used before the dash; and after the dash in an unfinished exclamatory sentence.

It is set *inside* quotation marks if it is a part of the quotation; otherwise, *outside*.

Gentlemen may cry, "Peace! Peace!" but there is no peace.

Think of it! the only words that this man could find to say when he was confronted with the consequences of the flagrant recklessness of his conduct were that he was "sorry"! Sorry! God save the mark!

It is set *inside* the closing parenthesis only when the parenthetical passage alone is exclamatory.

And it was on the fourth day of July (behold the irony of Fate!) that this blow was struck at the very foundation of our liberties.

The Question Mark

The question mark, or interrogation point, has but three strictly proper uses: —

1. To mark a direct question.

Direct questions may, or may not, be interrogative *in form*. The first category scarcely needs exemplification. The following are examples of questions not interrogative in form, to which the mark adds the necessary interrogative force.[1]

Even if she did offer you her hand, — as she did to me, — it was as if across a broad river. Trick of manner, or a bit of truth peeping out? — CONRAD.

And then he said, — or asked, for there was always a question in his voice, — "I shall go back? Back to my home? I shall buy the picture? And hang it on the wall of the room where I was born? — CLAUDIA CRANSTON.

Then said the Pearl Empress: "Possibly the harmony of her voice solaced the Son of Heaven?"

But he replied, "She spoke not." — L. ADAMS BECK.

"Then I suppose they'll soon bring the white bread and the brown?" Alice ventured to remark. — LEWIS CARROLL.

And the spirit-lamp is in case you should wake in the night — you could make yourself a cup of cocoa? — A. D. SEDGWICK.

But, at least, if the Greeks do not give character, they give ideal beauty? — RUSKIN.

[1] See, for other examples, W. P. Garrison's paper, heretofore cited: *Atlantic*, August, 1906, p. 234.

Now whether, seeing these two things, fate and power, we are permitted to believe in unity? — EMERSON.

2. Interpolated between parentheses — or, in quoted matter, between brackets — to suggest a doubt as to the accuracy of a statement, the proper form of a name, or the like.[1]

We are told that the gentleman who has been carrying on this game, a member of the English peerage (?), is the heir to large estates.

The novels of Turgenev (?) are still popular in certain circles, especially in France.

3. To take the place of an uncertain or unknown fact or date.

The Venerable Bede lived in the twelfth century, (?) to (?)

This mark is frequently, but always incorrectly, used with an indirect question.

He asked me where I was going?

Ask Spurgheim, ask the doctors, ask Quetelet, if temperaments decide nothing? or if there be anything they do not decide? — EMERSON.

Two question marks, with quotation marks between, may be used in an interrogative sentence which ends with a quoted question; as, —

[1] The strictures of *The King's English*, quoted above (p. 149), on the use of "a bracketed stop," apply with equal force to such use of a question mark and an exclamation mark. Mr. Woolley (*Handbook of Composition*, p. 98) says that the use of the question mark "as a notice of humor or irony is a puerility."

"Lemuel," she said, "what was it you meant when you said, 'Where d' you s'pose I've been?'?"

But the better, although perhaps the less logical, practice is to let one question mark suffice — thus: . . . been'?"

NOTE. — Certain words, especially "how" and "what," often seem to give an interrogative form to what is really an exclamatory sentence. This is a subject as to which no final rule can be laid down: the author is the best judge of his own meaning.

In a compound interrogative sentence, that is, one containing a series of questions, it is generally the better practice to reserve the question mark for the end, separating the earlier questions with commas, or semicolons, as the circumstances demand. But the question mark may be repeated after each question, to give added emphasis to each.

This mark is set *inside* quotation marks if the quoted passage forms a question; otherwise, *outside*.

In this sentence from Matthew Arnold's essay on Marcus Aurelius, the question mark should be outside; but it is fair to say that it is taken here from a reprint in a collection of essays by various hands, and it is not at all certain that Arnold was guilty of the error.

What would have become of his notion of the *exitiabilis superstitio*, of the "obstinacy of the Christians?"

Quotation Marks

The use of single quotation marks ("quotes") in the "Atlantic" was adopted some years ago, on expert advice, for typographical reasons alone, although there is an abundance of precedents for it in the practice of some of the best British printing-offices and publishers.[1] In the narrow (14-pica) measure of the columns of the magazine the double quotes take up an unconscionable amount of room, where they occur at all frequently, thereby interfering seriously with good spacing, and at the same time give an unpleasantly "spotty" appearance to the page. The publishers have not had occasion to regret their long-meditated decision to make this change, which involved, of course, using the double mark for interior quotations. If there is, as sometimes happens, a third quotation within the second, we recur to the single mark, and so on.[2]

In Atlantic books, the customary use of double quotes, with single quotes inside, is followed.

The ordinary use of quotes, to enclose a direct

[1] For example, the single quotes are used in *The King's English*, so often drawn upon in this book; and in Mr. Hart's work, cited in the next note.

[2] Mr. Hart, in his *Rules for Compositors and Readers*, etc., quotes from Mr. De Vinne this example of quotation marks packed five deep: 'In the New Testament we have the following words: "Jesus answered them, 'Is it not written in your law, "I said, 'Ye are gods'"?'"'

quotation, needs no elaboration. Their position with reference to other punctuation marks is discussed with reference to those marks respectively. We may recapitulate thus: they are always set *outside* the comma and the period; always *inside* the colon and semicolon; *outside* or *inside* the marks of exclamation and interrogation according as those marks do or do not belong to the quoted matter; *outside* the dash when it stands for something left unsaid, and *inside* when it is used as an ordinary punctuation mark; *inside* parentheses when the parenthetical clause alone is quoted, otherwise *outside*.[1]

Quotes are properly used to set off words accompanied by definitions, unless such words are set in a different type, as italic or bold-face.

Mighty of heart, mighty of mind, — "magnanimous," — to be this, is indeed to be great in life. — RUSKIN.

They are properly used with words to which special attention is called, or which have a special meaning in the text.

Such a newspaper paragraph would be as impossible in a Christian country as a deliberate assassination permitted on its public street. "Christian," did I say? — RUSKIN.

[1] For a discussion of this whole question of the right order as between quotation marks and other "stops" from the English point of view, — which, however logical, is at variance with the common American practice, — see *The King's English*, pp. 282 *ff.*

Observe how persistently your German sympathizer harps upon the words "hundred-per-cent American."

I said "minuteness" and "selfishness" of sensation, but, in a word, I ought to have said "injustice" or "unrighteousness" of sensation. — RUSKIN.

Perhaps "a young Minister of State" held the foremost rank in that respect. — MEREDITH.

"Free" was a word that checked her throbs as at a question of life or death. — MEREDITH.

Observe that word "State"; we have got into a loose way of using it. It means literally the standing and stability of a thing; and you have the full force of it in the derived word "statue" — the immovable thing. — RUSKIN.

With such sentences as, "Said I to myself," "I thought," "He might well have said," — that is to say, where the quasi-quotation, although in direct form, is not of words actually spoken, — the practice is not uniform; but, as one can see by consulting books written half a century ago, the use of quotes in such cases is becoming more and more general, and it is customary to use them in the "Atlantic."

1789 asked of a thing, Is it rational? 1642 asked of a thing, Is it legal? or, when it went further, Is it according to conscience? — SIR M. FOSTER.

He (the elephant) looked betune his feet at the dhrain, an' he looked at me, and I sez to myself: "Terence, my son, you've been watchin' this Noah's ark too long. Run for the life!" — KIPLING.

Then he wagged his ear, sayin', "Do my sinses deceive me?" as plain as print. — KIPLING.

"What can it be?" said I to myself: "it must be one of my old friends the dervishes of Meshed." — *Adventures of Hajji Baba*, Morier's translation.

I therefore began to take myself to task upon what I did know. Let me see, said I, I know, First, That all those who do not believe in Mahomet, and in Ali his lieutenant, etc. — *Adventures of Hajji Baba*.[1]

I recollect a nurse called Ann,
Who followed me about the grass;
And one fine day a fine young man
Came up and kissed the pretty lass.
She never made the least objection.
Thinks I, "Aha!
When I can talk, I'll tell mamma."
And that's my earliest recollection. — LOCKER.

The following examples show Meredith's inconsistencies in his treatment of quotations. The first is a direct quotation (repetition) of words previously spoken by one of the characters; the others are instances of passages in the form of direct quotations, but not actually spoken. All are taken from "Diana of the Crossways."

Her words rang through him. At every meeting she said things to confound his estimate of the wits of

[1] It is difficult to understand the use of quotes in the one case and their omission in a precisely similar case in the same book. Presumably the translator, or his copyist, was responsible in the first place, and the proof-reader failed to notice the difference. In the same volume are instances of direct quotations without quotes: "He mumbled Allah, Allah," etc.

woman, or [to] be remembered for some spirited ring they had: — *A light wind will make a dead leaf fly like a bird.*

Diana saw herself through the haze she conjured up. "Am I worse than other women?" was a piercing twi-thought.

With a complacent, What now, Dacier [he was alone], he fixed his indifferent eyes on the first column of the leaders.

He reviewed dozens of speculations until the impossibility of seizing one determined him to go to Mrs. Fryar-Gunnett at the end of the half-hour — "Just to see what these women have to say for themselves."

"For I am not one of the lecturing Mammonites," she could say.

Professor Tyndall sometimes used italics for a quasi-quotation.

A man, for example, can say, *I think, I feel, I love.*

In the next example his contemporary uses quotes in an exactly parallel case: —

The hypothesis of evolution supposes that, in all this vast progression, there would be no breach of the continuity, no point at which we could say, "This is a natural process," and, "This is not a natural process." — HUXLEY.

Occasionally one finds a distinction made, or attempted to be made, between direct quotations and the quasi-quotations illustrated in the foregoing examples, by using double quotes with the

first and single quotes with the others. But it is hard to maintain the distinction consistently, and it is disregarded in Atlantic books unless the author insists upon it.

The not infrequent practice, especially with certain authors, of using quotes with indirect quotations is not justifiable.

He used a certain penetrative mildness of tone in saying that "he hoped the book would succeed." — MEREDITH.

The quotes should be omitted, or the sentence changed, to read: He used . . . in saying, "I hope the book will succeed."

He then followed my example, declared he never felt more refreshed in his life, and . . . said, "he would go and look after the horses." — BORROW.[1]

Quotes should not be used with foreign words or phrases except under the same conditions as with English ones; such words or phrases should be set in italics, if it is necessary to give them extra prominence.

In the "Atlantic" and in Atlantic books, verse extracts are always set in smaller type, and no quotes are used unless the verses are put in somebody's mouth.

There is in our modern world conflict of a sort, but without battle-cries and without leaders, like the

[1] Quoted in *The King's English*, p. 289.

battle of embryo atoms in Milton's Chaos, mixed confusedly: —

> To whom these most adhere, he rules a moment.

But the words were laughable or pathetic. I was adjured to

> "Blow de mon down with a bottle of rum,
> Oh, de mon — mon — blow de mon down!"

For one thing, there is the impulse to cry out, "Stop! Stop! don't cut it all off!

> "O barber, spare that hair!
> Leave some upon my brow!
> For months it's sheltered me,
> And I'll protect it now!"

So with prose extracts: if they are at all numerous, — that is, in an article in the magazine, if there are more than two or three, — they are set in smaller type, without quotes unless they are put in somebody's mouth. If there are but two or three, even though they are of considerable length, the type is not reduced, and quotes are used.

If a letter is printed with date-line and salutation (or either), or with signature, it is set off by blank lines above and below, without quotes and, except in fiction, is set in smaller type. But if there is neither date-line, nor salutation, nor signature, the letter is ordinarily set in the text type, with quotes. If there are many letters, they are all set in smaller type, without quotes.[1]

[1] In the magazine, considerations of space, and the necessity of expanding or contracting articles, are sometimes the decisive factors in arranging the matter of the setting of prose extracts.

If a quoted passage contains more than one paragraph, the quotes are repeated at the beginning of each paragraph, but are placed at the end of the last one only. The old practice of repeating them at the beginning of each line is not now in vogue in the United States, although it persists to some extent, especially in newspapers, in Great Britain.

If a quoted passage consists of a complete sentence, with subject and predicate, it is the better practice to begin it with a capital; otherwise, if it is only a phrase, or a part of a sentence that is completed by the unquoted text.

Having, as Stevenson says, "thrown her soul and body down for God to plough them under," she has grown up out of that furrow with a certain fierceness of joy in life. — E. YEOMANS.

The tendency to use unnecessary quotation marks should be guarded against. It may be said that this is true of every punctuation mark, as well as of a good many other things, and that it may well be assumed to be the function of such books as this to point out when they are unnecessary. But the special point here in mind is the frequent use of these marks with phrases that are, from long acquaintance, familiar in our minds as household words. The last seven words, for instance, would often, but, we believe, unnecessarily, be surrounded by quotes. "To an educated

man it is an annoyance to find his author warning him that something written long ago, and quoted every day almost ever since, is not an original remark now first struck out."[1]

The Apostrophe

1. The apostrophe is used chiefly as the sign of the possessive case. It precedes the *s* in the possessive of singular nouns and of plurals not ending in *s*: *the man's coat; men's coats.* It follows the *s* in the plural of nouns ending in *s*: *the boys' coats.*

NOTE. — In forming the possessive case of singular nouns ending in *s*, the apostrophe should be followed by a second *s*, as with other nouns, except in a few cases in which traditional usage demands that it be omitted: *Jesus'*, *conscience'* (for conscience' sake), *Moses'*; and classical proper names ending in *es*: *Xerxes'*, *Alcibiades'*, and the like. If the pronunciation of the second *s* is harsh to the ear, it can be disregarded in reading; but it should always be *printed*, except as noted above.

2. The omission of figures in dates is indicated by an apostrophe: *the men of '76; the 17th of June, '75;* also, the omission of a letter or letters in contracted forms: *'T is, he'll, is n't, wa'n't*, etc.

NOTE. — Mr. G. Bernard Shaw has adopted the practice of writing *dont*, *shant*, etc., instead of *don't*, *sha'n't*, etc.; but it may be doubted whether this idiosyncrasy will ever receive the sanction of good usage.

[1] *The King's English*, p. 280. The authors comment thus upon this address of a letter: "John Smith, Esq., 'Chatsworth,' 164 Melton Road, Leamington": "The implication seems to be: living in the house that sensible people call 164 Melton Road, but one fool likes to call Chatsworth."

3. The plural form of single letters, of words, and sometimes of phrases, is indicated by an apostrophe.

Mind your *p*'s and *q*'s.

There were not a few "if's" and "may be's" in his remarks.

NOTE. — In the poem "Caliban upon Setebos," in which the pronoun referring to Caliban is omitted at the beginning of nearly every sentence, Browning indicated the missing word by an apostrophe, set as modern practice would set the same mark to indicate the omission of a letter — as in *'t is*.

> 'Will sprawl, now that the heat of day is best,
> Flat on his belly in the pit's much mire.

So far as the writer's experience goes, this is a unique case of the use of this device; and it seems so illogical, and so likely to mislead (if it is not taken for a misprint), that in preparing the copy for a recent reprint of the poem, he took out the apostrophe in every such instance. But the editor of the volume in which the reprint appeared preferred to leave them "as Browning wrote them"; and his preference was followed — under protest.

Although in modern usage the apostrophe in the possessive case of the pronoun *it* has been discarded, the old form, *it's*, still persists to some extent. The chief objection to it, aside from the fact that it has been generally discarded, is that it not infrequently may, so far as the context goes, be mistaken for a contraction of *it is*. Like many other errors, it has been known to "get by" in the "Atlantic."

ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS are rarely tolerated in the text, except in the case of letters, or quoted passages, when the habit of abbreviating certain words may be an essential part of the author's characteristic style.[1]

"I know of hardly any words," says Cobbett, "that ought to be abbreviated; and if these were not, it would be all the better. People may indulge themselves in this practice, until at last they come to write the greater part of their words in single letters. The frequent use of abbreviations is always a mark of slovenliness and vulgarity. I have known Lords abbreviate almost the half of their words; it was, very likely, because they did not know how to spell them to the end."[2]

As is likely to be the case with the observations of this erratic genius, there is a certain amount of good sense beneath the outer surface of exaggeration. But having yielded to the temptation to quote this passage, to show how almost invariably he pointed his admonitions with a "dig" at some one of his pet aversions, — in this case, the

[1] When tabulated matter, or lists of names, or the like, are embodied in the text, shortened forms may be used much more freely; but, except in frankly statistical or quasi-statistical articles and books, it is generally better to consign such matter to footnotes.

[2] *English Grammar*, edition of 1906, p. 83.

"Lords," — we may add that we are not here concerned with the class of abbreviations which he had in mind. There is more timeliness in the recent protest of a professor of English against the "Plague of Abbreviation."

If "that blessed word Mesopotamia" were in practical use to-day, it would doubtless suffer the horror of becoming *Meso.*, or *Ma.*;[1] for witness the fate of Pennsylvania and that blessed word California, over the sonority of which commerce does not permit us to linger. Oh, for a little leisure in an age of short cuts! We are wedded to abbreviation — and have been previously divorced from courtesy. The present writer has determined to take an occasional holiday from this orgy of shortening, and to permit himself, on envelopes and elsewhere, the luxury of polysyllables. North shall not become a negation, or east a mere initial. The post-office clerk shall not dim his sight in profane endeavors to distinguish Missouri from Maine, and New York from New Jersey. Esquire shall flaunt its full ensign, though Mr. must remain dwarfed for lack of a fair fullness. One cannot permit Mister; it should be used only in humorous stories.

The following common abbreviations are used in all cases, when accompanied by proper names.

Mr.	Mme., Mlle.	Sr.
Mrs.[2]	Messrs.	Dr.
M.	Jr.	Esq.

[1] This author seems to have overlooked the quite familiar *Mespot.*

[2] It is a curious fact that "Mister" always connotes vulgarity, or, perhaps, humor. On the other hand, "Mistress," except in the

Reverend (Very Reverend, Right Reverend, Most Reverend), Honorable (Right Honorable), should not be abbreviated, except in quoted matter, nor should Superintendent and Professor.

Military and Naval titles should be spelled in full, but U.S.A., U.S.N., R.A., R.N., and the like, are usual forms, even in the text; as are the symbols of university degrees and honorary titles, as A.B., A.M., Ph.D., Litt.D., M.D., F.R.S., R.A., and the like.

The abbreviations B.C. and A.D., and A.M. and P.M., are seldom spelled out, and are always printed in small capitals, without spaces.

The special formula SOS — the wireless signal for assistance — is not an abbreviation, and therefore should be set without periods and without spaces, and not, as is so frequently seen, S. O. S.

It is better always, in the text, to avoid the use of *i.e.* ("that is"), *e.g.* ("for example"), *viz.* ("namely"), *inst.*, *prox.*, *ult.* ("instant, proximo, ultimo"); but *vide* and *circa*, which are, of course, not abbreviations, though sometimes classed as such, may properly be used.

The character & (called "ampersand" or "short

Southern part of the United States, has an old-fashioned, almost archaic, sound; indeed, there is rather a widely diffused ignorance of the fact that *Mrs.* is an abbreviation of "Mistress," which, in its strict signification, is properly applied to any woman, married or single, who is at the head of a household. In its more familiar modern sense, the word is never used as a title, and never abbreviated.

and") is used — again except in quoted matter — only in the established names of firms or corporations.[1]

As to the forms *&c.* and *etc.* — the former is never used in the text. The latter is avoided wherever possible, being replaced by "and so forth," "and so on," "and the like," or some similar phrase.

On this subject Mr. Cobbett reaches the right conclusion, although his logic is not beyond reproach. "Instead of the word *and*, you often see people put &. For *what* reason I should like to know. But to this & is sometimes added a *c:* thus, *&c. And* is, in Latin, *et*, and *c* is the first letter of the Latin word *cætera*, which means *the like*, or *so on.*[2] Therefore this *&c.* means *and the like* or *and so on.* This abbreviation of a foreign word is a most convenient thing for such writers as have too much indolence or too little sense to say fully and clearly what they ought to say. If you mean to say *and the like*, or, *and so on*, why not say it? This abbreviation is very frequently made use of without the writer having any idea of its import. A writer on grammar says: 'When these words are joined to *if*, *since*, *&c.*, they are adverbs!' But where is *the like* of *if*, or of *since?* The best

[1] In printing such names, care should be taken to obtain the correct form. It is especially annoying to publishers to be "called out of their names."

[2] His definition of *cætera* leaves something to be desired.

way to guard yourself against the committing of similar errors is *never* to use this abbreviation."[1]

It seems not worth while to cumber these pages with lists of the "authorized" abbreviations of the titles of the books of the Bible and of the names of the states, all of which are ordinarily printed in full in the text, and of proper names, of which abbreviated forms are often used, especially in dialogue and in letters. As to the latter, however, it may be said that one cannot safely assume that, because a man is called "Tom," or "Joe," or "Fred," or by some other *petit nom*, his real name is Thomas, or what-not. An examination of the Congressional Directory, say, or of the Harvard Quinquennial, will disclose some curious facts in this connection — even that some persons "carry" a middle initial which apparently stands for nothing, not being followed by a period.[2]

Abbreviations are used freely in footnotes. This is a matter in which it is quite hopeless to expect uniformity of treatment on the part of the author; so that it is peculiarly within the province of the proof-reader, under the general guidance of the author in technical matters.

[1] *English Grammar*, edition of 1906, p. 83.

[2] Within a comparatively few years, a United States Senator from a Southern state bore the historic-sounding name of "Jeff" Davis; but his baptismal name fell short of its promise in the matter of orthography, being "Jeff" *tout court*. For the use or omission of the period in certain abbreviated forms, see the section on the "Period," *supra*.

CAPITALIZATION

A COMPARISON of the so-called rules for capitalization given in different manuals, handbooks, etc., varying from a dozen or fifteen to three-score (there are fifty-seven in the "Manual of Style" issued by the University of Chicago Press), makes it evident enough that, except in those cases as to which no one requires instruction,[1] the use of capital letters is largely a matter of taste — sometimes of the author's taste, but often of the printer's. To cover every conceivable case, the rules must necessarily be so numerous that compositors cannot be expected to carry them in their heads; nor is it possible, within reasonable limits of space, so to frame them that the time spent in consulting them can be depended on to yield satisfactory results. So that copy should be prepared with special care in this respect — by the author if he has definite wishes and would have them respected; by the editor of the copy, in an endeavor to ensure consistency, at least; and the proofreader should see to it that such consistency is attained.

[1] For instance, that a period is always followed by a capital, that proper names begin with capitals, as does each line in poetry; and that the nominative singular of the first personal pronoun, I, is always a capital; also, the interjection, O.

A great number of the rules to which reference has been made deal with scientific terms — geological epochs, names of botanical or zoölogical genera and species, and the like — as to which the usage of scholars is pretty well fixed; and in books or articles dealing chiefly with such subjects, the author should be requested to look carefully to the proper distribution of capitals in the copy, and the copy should then be followed.

Another category consists of geographical terms. There is a long list, which it is hardly possible to make all-inclusive, of words like Bay, Mountain, Cape, River, Strait, and the rest, as to which an intelligent proof-reader needs no instruction. One can hardly conceive of Atlantic ocean, Mississippi river, Hudson's bay, mount Washington, the isthmus of Panama, or Long island, outside the columns of the daily newspaper,[1] even in the absence of a rule that such words are to be capitalized. Another list, as to which usage is equally well established, includes the names of the great divisions of the earth's surface, and of distinct regions or districts: Western Hemisphere, Arctic Circle, North Pole, Torrid Zone, Equator, Great Divide, Northwestern Territory.

Still another category includes both historical and political designations for alliances, parties,

[1] It may be well to say, once for all, that newspaper "style" is not regarded as authority in "polite book and magazine circles."

classes, movements, religious denominations, schools of philosophy and art. Also the established titles, official or unofficial, of civic, military, religious, educational, social, commercial, and industrial organizations and institutions.

As to all the above, it is believed to be the better course to leave possible doubtful cases to be decided as they arise, rather than to attempt the hopeless task of making lists that will not leave even more cases in doubt.

The few rules given below prescribe the usage intended to be followed in the "Atlantic" and in all Atlantic books, as to cases in which the general usage is not uniform. Except when contrary directions are given, it is to be understood that capitals are to be used in the cases specified.

It may be said, generally, that British writers use capitals much more freely than is usual in this country. It is equally true that the French use them more sparingly; and in translations the better practice is to follow French usage where it can be done without offense: for example, to print "rue Royale," "place de Grève"; but not, "marshal Foch," or "the american army."

1. After introductory words introducing a direct quotation.

In that great sense — "La donna e mobile," not "Qual pium' al vento;" no, nor yet "Variable as the shade, by the light quivering aspen made." — RUSKIN.

She sent word off to Lady Dunstane: "You know the interest I have always taken in dear Constance," etc. — MEREDITH.

But quoted phrases, or clauses, when introduced as part of a sentence, may properly begin with a small letter. As in the continuation of the above,

. . . inviting her to come on a visit . . . that she might join in the ceremony of a wedding "likely to be the grandest of our time."

To put the difficulty into a clear shape, and exhibit to you the grounds for indecision, that is all they generally do for you! — and well for them and for us, if indeed they are able to "to mix the music with our thoughts, and sadden us with heavenly doubts." — RUSKIN.

2. Titles, official, professional, or honorary, used with or without the name of the holder, to designate a particular ruler, pontiff, chief magistrate, or high official, past or present.

The King opened Parliament in person.

The President conferred to-day with several Republican Senators.

The Prime Minister appeared in the House to-day for the first time since his return from the Conference.

The Pope has addressed a letter to all the belligerents, urging some sort of a conference with a view to a cessation of hostilities.

The committee of the Cabinet consists of the Secretary of State, the Attorney-General, and the Postmaster General.

But

The position of the president of the United States is more akin to that of the prime minister of Great Britain than to that of the king.

Since 1870, no pope has ever left the Vatican.

Under our form of government the secretary of state, postmaster-general and other cabinet officers are mere department heads and have no responsibility for the policies of the administration.

The titles of lesser dignitaries (governor, mayor, prefect, minister, justice, and the like) should not be capitalized when used without the name, unless special prominence is given to a particular person, as often in fiction and in biographical works. This further exception is to be noted: in the salutatory clause of a letter, print: "*My dear Governor*"; and in the introductory words of an address: "*Mr. Mayor, ladies and gentlemen.*"

Titles, or forms of address, attached, by law or custom, to certain offices or dignities: "*His Majesty*," "*Her Grace*," "*Your Excellency*," "*Your Honor.*"

3. Words indicating relationship, only when used with the name of the person, and without a possessive pronoun.

I looked up and saw Uncle John.

But

He bears a strong resemblance to his father.

The next to arrive was my aunt Mary.

4. Of the particles (prepositions) which form a part of many foreign names, *Van* (Dutch) is always capitalized, *von* (German), *de* (French), and *di* (Italian), never, whether with or without a Christian name.

Jan Van Eyck; that particular portrait was painted by Van Eyck.

Guy de Maupassant; at the head of all short-story writers stands de Maupassant.

Prince von Bismarck, by his manipulation of the famous Ems despatch, really brought on the Franco-Prussian War.

Not long after the outbreak of the Great War, von Moltke was replaced by von Falkenhayn as chief of the German General Staff.

Gabriel d'Annunzio; among the well-known men who took service in the Italian Aviation was d'Annunzio.

In the great stream of books and articles relating to the late war, special care must be given to these names, as the particles are used or omitted without regard to uniformity. It may make little practical difference whether one writes Moltke, or Von Moltke, or von Moltke; but the same form should, at least, be used through an article.

5. *Ministry*, *Administration*, *Cabinet*, and *Government* when referring to an *existing* body of officials invested with administrative, executive, or advisory functions; but not when used in other senses, or as referring to previous similar bodies.

The term *Coalition* should be printed with a capital always when referring to a particular instance of that form of ministry.

The Coalition Government is doing its utmost to discredit Great Britain in the eyes of the whole world.

The Ministry have apparently made up their minds, at last, to take some steps in the direction of righting this flagrant injustice.

President Wilson met his full Cabinet to-day for the first time since his illness.

It has always been the policy of the United States government to hold itself aloof from any interference in the affairs of the Old World.

The cabinet, as such, has no *legal* status. Only the individuals who compose it are amenable for their official acts.

The names of government departments and bureaus, and of high administrative, legislative, and judicial bodies: *The State Department, the Bureau of Immigration, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Chamber of Deputies, the Congress, the Supreme Court of the United States.*

But the words, *department, bureau, commission, committee, court,* when used without specific designation, should not be capitalized; nor should *legislature* (of the states); or *house* or *senate*, except in speaking of the branches of the supreme legislative body in any country.

6. *Church* and *State*, when used in apposition,

to denote respectively the religious and political organizations, whether of the whole world, or of a particular country.

Church when it is part of the name, either of a religious denomination, or of a building; the *Church of Latter-Day Saints*, the *Old South Church*.

Cathedral and *Chapel*, as part of the name of a religious edifice; as *Cathedral of St. John the Divine;* the *Chapel Royal*.

The States (meaning the United States), *the States of the Church*, the *Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, the *State of New York*, etc.

But *state* or *states* (not meaning the whole country), and *commonwealth*, when not accompanied by the name, are not capitalized.

NOTE. — *Commonwealth*, standing alone, is capitalized only when it refers to the government of England under Cromwell.

7. *Empire*, *Kingdom*, *Republic*, when part of a name; also, when standing alone as representing a particular government. Also, the *Dominion* (Canada), the *Union* (United States or South Africa).

8. Well-established names for particular periods or epochs: as *the Renaissance*, *the Dark Ages*, *the Crusades* (the period or the expeditions), *the Inquisition* (the period or the institution), *the Restoration* (in England, of the Stuarts; in France, of the Bourbons).

9. The accepted descriptive names of wars: *the*

Wars of the Roses, the Peloponnesian War, the Civil War, the Franco-Prussian War.

Among the various titles that have been given to the late conflict, the United States Government is said to have decided, officially, upon the *World War*, which should be capitalized.

The names of important congresses, conferences, councils, or other political assemblages, for whatever purpose convoked: *the Congress of Vienna, the Council of Trent, the National Democratic Convention.*

Also the treaties or agreements by which wars have been ended, or suspended: *the Peace of Amiens, the Convention of Closter-seven, the Treaty of Utrecht, the Peace Conference* at Paris. *The Armistice* (of November, 1918) is generally capitalized.

Also titles of important charters, documents, statutes: *Magna Charta, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution* (of the United States or France, but not of the individual states), *the Bull Unigenitus, the Oath of the Tennis-Court, the Statute of Frauds.*

10. *East* and *West* (also *Orient* and *Occident*) as the two great general sections of the world.

Oh! East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,
Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God's great Judgment Seat.

East, West, North, and *South,* etc., when indicating one portion of a country (particularly of the

United States) as distinguished from, or contrasted with, another portion. *Eastern*, *Western*, etc., when used with the name of a country or region, with some other connotation than mere geographical position.

11. All words standing for the Deity, or for one of the three persons of the Trinity;[1] the Bible, and all synonyms therefor (the adjective *Biblical*, but not *scriptural*); the accepted titles of parables, and of familiar precepts from the Bible; creeds and confessions of faith.

The names of the sacred books of other faiths: as *Koran*, *Talmud*.

The *Devil*, *Satan*, the *Evil One*, etc., when applied to the being supposed to personify evil; but not when used as expletives.

Nature and *Fortune*, when personified and used in connection with the personal pronouns "she," or "her."

12. Both elements of a hyphenated title, when the first element is capitalized: *Attorney-General*, *Provost-Marshal*.

13. Generally speaking, only nouns and adjectives in the title of books and plays. The article "the" is not usually included as a part of the title; and that article is frequently, but erroneously,

[1] The nominative and accusative of the personal pronoun — *He* and *Him*, *Thou* and *Thee* — are capitalized in this connection, but not the possessives, *his* and *thine*.

used instead of "a" in such familiar titles as "A Tale of Two Cities," "A Midsummer Night's Dream."

NOTE. — The late war has brought into frequent use a great number of words, as to the capitalization or non-capitalization of which usage is still in a very fluid state, the tendency being to capitalize many of them because of their immediate prominence in the flood of literature relating to the war. The tendency should, we think, be resisted; but at present one can only deal with them as they appear.

ITALICS

THERE is not much that need be said as to the use of italic type, either in the "Atlantic" itself or in Atlantic books.

1. In the magazine, titles of books, pamphlets, and periodicals are set in italic, both in the text and in footnotes. In Atlantic books they are so set only in footnotes; in the text they are set in roman and quoted.

2. Foreign words and phrases are ordinarily italicized, unless they are of such frequent occurrence as to be practically naturalized in English.

Your *Kater-Gefühl*, however, in your second letter, about your *Auslassungen* on the subject of Wundt, amused me by its speedy evolution into *Auslassungen* more animated still. — W. JAMES.

Our children would term it "calling names." Mefódi and Annushka would probably call it *rugánie*. — E. BONTA.

. . . his great glory is that he pretended to take cognizance of man's moral nature to its deepest, most uninfluenced, and, as the French say, most *scabreux* depths. — H. JAMES.

When constantly kept there, night after night, it made this curious *diverticulum*. — A. W. HOWLETT.

Balzac was the hardest and deepest of *prosateurs;* the earth-scented facts of life, which the poets put under their feet, he had put above his head. — H. JAMES.

Making all allowance for the pressure and tyranny of circumstances, we may believe that if he had greatly cared to *se recueillir*, as the French say . . . he would sometimes have found an opportunity for it. — H. JAMES.

The italics are intended, of course, to call attention to the fact that the word or phrase in question has not been "anglicized," as the phrase goes; consequently, if quotes are used for the same purpose, the italics are not needed. When, however, the word or phrase is put in somebody's mouth, there seems to be no reason why it should not be italicized, the quotes being then used for another purpose.

It is so difficult as to be almost impossible to draw the line between foreign words and phrases that have been anglicized and those that have not been. The lists given in the various style books and manuals do not always agree; for example, the "Handbook of Style" issued by the Riverside Press includes in its list of words not to be italicized — a list substantially identical with that given in the "Manual of Style" of the University of Chicago Press — the following, all of which Mr. Booth, in his "Practical Guide for Authors," published by the same house, bids us print in italic:

confrère, *cortège*, *élite*, *habitué*, *mêlée*, *résumé*, *tête-à-tête*, and *vis-à-vis*.[1] Furthermore, both these authorities confuse matters by unnecessarily including in their lists of words *not* to be italicized certain ones as to which it is hardly possible to conceive of any question arising, although they are, to be sure, of foreign extraction: *alibi*, *bas-relief*, *bouquet*, *bulletin*, *connoisseur*, *criterion*, *data*, *diarrhœa*, *doctrinaire*, *ennui*, *etiquette*, *facsimile*, *innuendo*, *manœuvre*, *massage*, *memorandum*, *menu*, *naïve*, *niche*, *omnibus*, *prestige*, *rendezvous*, *rôle*, *seraglio*, *sobriquet*. (Some of these are to be found in one list, some in the other, and some in both.)

No list is offered here, for the reason that ordinary usage is so fluctuating and uncertain, and the preferences of authors are so divergent, that we can scarcely hope to make rules that would not be frequently broken.

In the infancy of the automobile, the words which it brought into use — *chauffeur*, *tonneau*, *chassis*, and all the rest — were naturally printed in italics; and it was the same with the aeroplane — *fuselage*, for example. But all these words have been taken over into English, and all are almost invariably printed in roman to-day. More

[1] It should be said that Mr. Booth's list is taken from Mr. Hart's *Rules for Compositors and Readers*, already referred to, and so, of course, gives the English practice; but there seems to be no reason for any variance in this regard between English and American printers.

recently, we have had the same experience with the new vocabulary of the war: *camouflage*, which had to be italicized for our instruction five or six years ago, would have a queer look in that type to-day.

Such words as we have been last considering, if italicized once, are — or should be — italicized always. But the practice is different when words so unmistakably foreign that no question can arise as to their being proper subjects for italics are used more than once. In such cases, it is Atlantic usage to print them in roman after the first time. For example, in Mr. Bonta's story, from which a passage is quoted above, the word *rugánie* is used again and again, but is italicized only once.

It is not customary to print in italic passages from foreign languages that contain a subject and predicate, no matter how short they may be; and in conversation, in which one or more of the interlocutors occasionally "drop into" a foreign vernacular, only single words or phrases — interjectional or otherwise: as *C'est bien*, *mon Dieu!* and so forth — are italicized. But if, *in a translation*, a passage is left in the original, untranslated, it is better to italicize the whole passage; as in the following translations of portions of Balzac's letters.

I must go over things, correct them again, put everything *à l'état monumental*. — H. James.

The first lived on the blood of Europe; *il s'est inoculé des armées.* — H. JAMES.

Decidedly, I will send to Tours for the Louis XVI secretary and bureau; the room will then be complete. It's a matter of a thousand francs; but for a thousand francs what can one get in modern furniture? *Des platitudes bourgeoises, des misères sans valeur et sans goût.* — H. JAMES.

3. There are certain abbreviations, mainly of Latin words, as to which there is some conflict of authority regarding the proper type to be used. The more familiar ones are: *e.g.*, *i.e.*, *et seq.*, *ibid.*, *id.* (*idem*), *cit.*, *ubi sup.* (*ubi supra*), *loc. cit.*, *v.* (*vide*), *cf.*, *cp.*, *vs.* (*versus*). All of these are kept out of the text, both of the magazine and of Atlantic books (except in quoted matter), and when used in footnotes are always italicized. The same is true of the sometimes used unabbreviated forms of certain ones of them, which are put in parentheses above; also, of *circa* and *infra*. On the other hand, *etc.*, *viz.*, *inst.*, *prox.*, and *ult.* are always set in roman.

4. Italics are frequently used to give emphasis to certain words. It goes without saying that some writers are much more addicted to this practice than others, and it is perhaps not unfair to say that it is particularly affected by a certain type of "lady novelist," as the habit of underscoring many words in a letter is supposed to be characteristic of female correspondents. But with such

we are not concerned. An author, of course, is the best judge of the words to which he wishes to lend special emphasis, and the function of the proof-reader and editor is confined to making sure, when possible, that the author's wishes are understood and respected — a thing much less difficult with respect to books, which always have the benefit of the author's revision, than with respect to articles in a magazine, proofs of which do not always go outside the office.

I am not going abroad; I can't afford it. . . . I have a heavy year of work next year, and shall very likely *need* to go the following summer. — W. JAMES.

I can find *nothing* sharp . . . on the different degrees of "liveliness" in hypotheses concerning the universe, or distinguish *a priori* between legitimate and illegitimate cravings. And when an hypothesis *is* once a live one, one *risks* something in one's practical relations toward truth and error, *whichever* of the three positions . . . one may take up towards it. *The individual himself is the only rightful chooser of his own risk.* — W. JAMES.

"It's all I can do to keep track of our makes," was the answer, "without looking after *your* back numbers." — KIPLING.

. . . the best ideas on every matter that literature touches, current at the time . . . I say *current* at the time, not merely accessible at the time. — ARNOLD.

France and England literally, observe, buy *panic* of each other; they pay, each of them, for ten thousand pounds worth of terror, a year. — RUSKIN.

But how, you will ask, is the idea of this guiding function of the woman reconcilable with a true wifely subjection? Simply in that it is a *guiding*, not a determining function. — RUSKIN.

But if you want copper stock, say of C. & H. quality, *when* you want it, and are bound to have it, then you must command more than a college professor's salary. — D. L. SHARP.

"What do you eat?" she asked.

"Three hearty meals a day," I answered.

"Not *breakfast!* . . . Why, St. George Dreamer *never* takes more than three drops of brandy on a lump of sugar in the morning." — M. P. MONTAGUE.

Finally one of the others said, "And what happened then?"

She answered, in a sepulchral tone, "*He spat!*" — LEIGHTON PARKS.

Men are forever talking about "faith," as if the important thing were the *quantity* of it, whereas the thing that matters is its *quality*. — LEIGHTON PARKS.[1]

[1] See the section on "Quotation Marks" for the occasional use of italics with what may be called supposititious or quasi-quotations.

SPELLING

In the matter of orthography, the "Atlantic" still adheres to the earlier tradition of the Riverside Press, where it was printed for so many years. The orthographic style of that establishment is known as "modified Webster"; that is to say, in those cases where there is equal authority for different ways of spelling a word, the form preferred by the editors of Webster's Dictionary — now known, in its most elaborate development, as the "International" — is followed except in certain specified words. The phrase "earlier tradition" is used because, within a few years, Riverside has reduced the list of exceptions by adopting the "Webster" spelling of the class of words of which *centre* (center) and *theatre* (theater) are the most common examples; whereas the "Atlantic" continues to use the termination *re*.

In but two other respects, we believe, does the "Atlantic" venture to disregard the tradition: we make a distinction between the noun *practice* and the corresponding verb by spelling the latter with *s* instead of *c;* and we differentiate between *ensure*, to make certain, to make sure (as to *ensure* one's safety, and the like), and *insure*, to protect, or

indemnify, against loss, whether in a technical or in a figurative sense.

The following list contains the words which, except in quoted matter, are spelled otherwise than according to the forms preferred by the International Dictionary.

Accoutre, accoutred, accoutring[1]
Adze
Amphitheatre
Anæsthesia
Asafœtida
Axe
Aye (= yes)
Baritone
Bastille
Bogey
Boulder
Bourgeon
Calibre
Centre (noun and verb)
Clue
Cyclopædia
Diarrhœa
Ensure (to make certain)
Entrust
Fæcal
Fæces
Fibre
Fibred
Fœtus
Glycerine
Good-bye
Gramme[2]
Gruesome
Homœopathy
Litre
Lustre
Manœuvre (noun and verb)
Maugre
Meagre
Mediæval
Metre[3]
Mitre
Moult
Mould
Moustache
Nitre

[1] The past tense and present participle of all other verbs ending in *re* in this list are formed on these models.

[2] Also, *kilogramme*, etc.

[3] Also *kilometre*, *millimetre*, etc. But *meter*, an instrument for measuring, as *water-meter*, and the like.

Ochre	Sabre
Orthopædic	Saltpetre
Pickaxe	Sepulchre
Plough (noun and verb)	Sepulchred
Practise (verb)	Sextette
Practised (adjective and participle)	Smoulder
Programme	Sombre
Quartette	Spectre
Quintette	Squirearchy
Reconnoitre	Syrup
Reinforce	Theatre
	Whiskey

It is hardly possible to assert any logical basis for these orthographic preferences, or, indeed, for any system of orthography thus far devised. (It is possible to find inconsistencies even in the recommendations of the advocates of "simplified spelling." [1]) One knows that some — perhaps many — of the forms preferred by the editors of the International are, literally, preferred by individuals. It is hard to see why the unanswerable logic that demands *defense* and *offense* instead of *defence* and *offence*, because of the Latin forms from which they are derived, does not, *eadem ratione*, insist upon *mediæval*.

There are those who would "prefer" to disregard the artificial rule adopted by the Interna-

[1] Mr. De Morgan, in the last of his posthumously published novels, *The Old Man's Youth*, observes, in one of his numerous digressions, that he has not yet discovered how "the phonetic school of spellers" proposes to distinguish between *prophet* and *profit*.

tional to the effect that words ending in *l*, *p*, *r*, *t* (and perhaps some other letters), preceded by a vowel, double the consonant before such terminations as *ed*, *ing*, *ous*, only in the case of monosyllables and of polysyllabic words having the accent on the last syllable. For example: —

dispelled, *controller*, *controlling*, but *traveled*, *raveling*, *marvelous; transshipped*, *equipped*, but *worshiper*, *worshiping; occurred*, *transferring*, but *altered*, *festering; petted*, *abetted*, but *trumpeter*, *trumpeted*.

But, for the present, the rule referred to, logical or not, is followed in the "Atlantic" and Atlantic books.

In these days, spelling seems to be largely a matter of "the taste and fancy of the speller," as Sam Weller said in reply to the judge's question as to how he spelled his name. It is doubtful whether, in any office, the spelling, even of the International Dictionary, is followed with unvarying exactness.[1] One occasionally falls in with an author who prefers to follow Worcester's Dictionary, or the Century, or the Standard; but such cases are becoming more and more infrequent, and copy is very seldom prepared strictly in conformity with such desire; so that, unless for some specially cogent reason, the regular Atlantic "style" is followed — or intended to be followed — in all publications

[1] Except, possibly, in the Government Printing Office at Washington.

of the Atlantic Monthly Press, as well as in the magazine.

The appearance of one of the numerous "handbooks of style" some years ago called forth, from a gentleman of much experience in typographical and literary matters, — who might, perhaps, be called, in modern parlance, a "bitter-ender," — a letter to the publishers in which the case for unadulterated Webster is argued as strongly as possible. We quote a few typical passages.

I do not for a moment contend that it is in any way the business or the duty of American printers to set up as spelling reformers, but I do say it is a part of their business and duty to reflect in their practice (so far as they themselves control it in regard to orthography) the best scientific and scholastic thought of the day.

The great publisher is in truth the guardian of forces that shall transmit unimpaired to posterity the rich literary legacy of the past, and the trustee of powers that make for the advancement of the literary standards of the future. In our American literary history the improved spellings of Webster are a precious heritage and I am as proud of them in their place and sphere as I am of any other American literary creation that is of permanent value. I cannot but regret with Mr. Howells that these distinctive spellings which were used in the earlier editions of Emerson,[1] Lowell, Haw-

[1] Whoever cares to take the trouble to examine the early editions of Emerson will wonder why he, at least, is included in the list. And we feel quite sure that any changes in the "spellings" of Lowell and Hawthorne have been in the opposite direction.

thorne and the rest of the great New England worthies of the 19th century should have disappeared to any extent whatever from the last issues. If the process goes on we shall, as Mr. Howells puts it, presently all go to *gaol*, — and why should we not, if we contentedly go to the *theatre?*

I wish that something might be done to awaken American publishers to what I feel is their real duty in this matter, — to restore the spellings of Webster to their former place in American-made books, so that the process of the rational development of English orthography, of which those spellings were the earliest and most important expression in modern times, may have a chance to go unhindered by powerful reactionary influence.

At the other extreme we may place the Richmond editor of whom Mr. De Vinne says that he once "sharply rebuked a new proof-reader: 'Why do you strike out of my proof the *u* in honour and the *k* in musick? I plainly wrote them in my copy.' The reader replied that he had been taught to follow the spelling of Webster and had found it acceptable elsewhere. 'Webster! never let me hear that name as an authority. Webster may spell to suit a Yankee trader, but not a Virginia gentleman.' " And an honorable place should be awarded a Boston gentleman who, it is said, when his secretary spelled *honour* without the *u*, told her that she might do it once, but that a second offense would lead to her discharge.

Midway between the two comes a certain dis-

tinguished and successful author of our own day, who is intolerant of the practice of clinging to the diphthong in *æsthetic* and *mediæval*, yet is equally perturbed by the Websterian spelling of *manœuvre* — *maneuver*. And there is the Harvard professor who wrote on a proof that passed through the present writer's hands, that it was "simply illiterate" to spell *traveller* and *marvellous* with a single *l*.

One is reminded of the remark attributed to the late Professor William James: "Is n't it abominable that everybody is expected to spell the same way?"

The writer of the letter quoted above animadverts severely upon a suggestion made by Mr. W. S. Booth, in his "Practical Guide to Authors," to this effect: "If an author wishes his book to be sold to English as well as to American readers, a sagacious publisher will advise him to use the *u* in spelling the words *honour*, *colour*, etc., and to avoid 'spelling reform' fads." It can be said that the Atlantic Monthly Press has not as yet shown its sagacity by adopting this suggestion in any of the books which it has published in English editions.

The class of words of which *honour* and *colour* are types forms a very large part of the list of "English spellings." With respect to such words, one or two points should be noted.

1. When the termination *ous* is added, the *u*

in the original word is dropped, even in English books: *clamour, clamorous; humour, humorous.*

2. *Glamour* with the *u* is preferred by all authorities, American and English.

3. The spelling *enamour* is not confined to England, but is preferred by Worcester.

There is no longer so sharp a distinction as there once was between English and American practice in the spelling of words ending in *ise* (*ize*), in which the consonant has the *z* sound. It is still more usual to find the *s* in all such words in the works of English authors; but the New English Dictionary, that monumental work, which may be regarded as the supreme authority on "English spelling," authorizes, and, in fact, adopts, the form with *z* with much liberality. So that the following list of words spelled only with *ise* may, it is believed, safely be followed in all cases.

Advertise	Demise	Franchise
Advise	Despise	Improvise
Affranchise	Devise	Incise
Appraise	Disfranchise	Merchandise
Apprise	Disguise	Premise (verb)
Chastise	Enfranchise	Reprise
Circumcise	Enterprise	Revise
Comprise	Exercise	Supervise
Compromise	Exorcise	Surmise

Analyse and *paralyse* are preferred to *analyze* and *paralyze* by the above-mentioned authority.

The following brief list contains the words, other than those comprised in the two classes described, of which the normal English spelling is different from those recommended by any American authority.

Abridgement	Forgather
Acknowledgement	Gaol
Cheque	Grey
Chequered	Inflexion
Connexion	Judgement
Dreamt [1]	Premiss (one of the parts of a syllogism)
Faggot	Reflexion
Forbears [2]	Waggon
Forfend	

The question whether English spelling is to be used never arises with regard to the magazine. The numerous articles by British authors that appear in its pages are made to conform to Atlantic style in this regard. On the only occasion within the writer's memory when an author — an American, by the way — insisted that certain distinctively English forms should be retained, it was thought advisable to insert a footnote to that effect.

[1] Also the past tense and past participle of other verbs when pronounced as if the final consonant were a *t:* as *leapt*, *learnt*, *spelt*. The past tense of *dream* is commonly pronounced in England, as in America, as if it were spelled "drempt."

[2] In the latest edition of the International Dictionary, this and the two words following are spelled as in this list.

If the Press publishes a book printed from plates made in Great Britain, the spelling, of course, is not changed. Other considerations than the expense of cutting the plates would prohibit such a course, even if it were otherwise deemed advisable. But the probability is strong that there would be no criticism. Whether, if we were setting up a new work by a British author, he would be "allowed" to spell as he would naturally be inclined to do, would probably depend upon how much he cared about it.

There are some special words, or categories, the form of which is not so much a matter of lexicographical authority or "correctness," as of taste. In all of them both alternative forms are found used almost indiscriminately by many writers, and the "Atlantic" has, for uniformity's sake, adopted one of them. A list follows; in each case the form so adopted is placed first.

Afterward, afterwards.
Backward, backwards.
Forward, forwards.
Toward, towards.
Amid, amidst.
Among, amongst.
While, whilst.

NOTE. — The first three are adverbs always, except that, in the terminology of some modern games, the title of "forward," used as a noun, is given to the person who plays in a certain position; in this sense, of course, it has no place in this discussion.

Toward is sometimes a preposition, sometimes an adverb, and sometimes what may be called a predicate adjective — as in such expressions as, "What is *toward?*" meaning "What is going on?" or "What's in the wind?" In the latter sense, *towards* is never used. Of the last three, the second forms are more generally used by English than by American writers. The prohibition of *amidst* and *amongst* (especially the latter) would not be rigidly enforced by the "Atlantic" if an author should especially desire to use them; but there is no distinction in meaning between them and the shorter forms which would justify the use of both in the same article.

As between *till* and *until*, no other distinction can be made than that the former is perhaps more appropriate to a lighter and less formal style. But there seems to be no reason for the not infrequent use of *'til*.

COMPOUND WORDS[1]

In the Introduction to the New English Dictionary, Sir James Murray says: "In many combinations the hyphen becomes an expression of unification of sense. When this unification and specialization has proceeded so far that we no longer analyze the combination into its elements, but take it in as a whole, as in *blackberry*, *postman*, *newspaper*, pronouncing it in speech with a single accent, the hyphen is usually omitted, and the fully developed compound is written as a single word. But as this also is a question of degree, there are necessarily many compounds as to which usage has not yet determined whether they are to be written with the hyphen or as single words."

If these remarks of one of the greatest of all authorities on such matters do not sufficiently indicate the complexity and uncertainty in which the subject is involved, we may quote Sir James further, as follows: —

"*There is no rule, propriety, or consensus of*

[1] This subject is discussed by most authorities under the heading, "Hyphens"; but inasmuch as one branch of the subject has to do with the question whether certain forms should be printed as a single solid word or as two separate words, the hyphen not entering into the discussion, the above seems to be the more appropriate heading.

usage in English for the use or absence of the hyphen, except in cases where grammar or sense is concerned [the italics are ours]; as in a day well remembered, but a well-remembered day, the sea is of a deep green, a deep-green sea, a baby little expected, a little-expected baby."

These two passages (the latter from the "Schoolmaster's Year-Book" for 1903) are quoted by Mr. Hart, in his "Rules for Compositors and Readers, etc." (page 23), perhaps as an explanation of his failure to elucidate the subject except in a very slight degree. "The hyphen," he says, "need not, as a rule, be used to join one adverb to the adjective which it qualifies; as in . . . 'a well calculated scheme.' When the word might not at once be recognized as an adverb, use the hyphen: as 'a well-known statesman.' "

(One asks one's self in vain why "well" cannot be recognized as an adverb as readily in the second case as in the first.)

To quote further: "A compound noun which has *but one accent, and* from familiar use has become one word, requires no hyphen." (But if "from familiar use *it has become one word,*" what difference does it make how many accents it has?)

"The following should also be printed as one word."[1] The list includes such words as "eye-

[1] Mr. Hart's usual accuracy is at fault here: if this instruction should be followed literally, we should have "one word" made up of about seventy-five compound words.

witness," which certainly has more than one accent; also "coeval," "coexist," "coextensive," which belong in a different category altogether.

"Compound words of *more than one accent*, as — ap'ple-tree', cher'ry-pie', grav'el-walk', will'-o'-the-wisp', as well as others which follow, require hyphens." But among the "others which follow" are many that have but one accent: as "arm-chair," "by-law," "hill-side," and so on.

We have quoted all that Mr. Hart says on this subject, except two more explicit and useful rules to which we shall refer later. On the other hand, in the "Manual of Style" issued by the Chicago University Press, there are no less than thirty rules dealing with the subject.

To show the hopeless detail of this treatment, — hopeless, because, unless the rules are faithfully committed to memory, the time necessary to be spent in looking up the rule applicable to any given case is unthinkable, — let us particularize a little.

"As a general rule, compounds of 'book,' 'house,' 'mill,' 'room,' 'shop,' and 'work' should be printed as one compact word, without a hyphen, when the prefixed noun contains only one syllable, should be hyphenated when it contains two, and should be printed as two separate words when it contains three or more."

A few of the examples given are: —

Schoolbook, pocket-book, reference book.
Boathouse, engine-house, business house.[1]
Sawmill, paper-mill, chocolate mill.
Bedroom, schoolroom, lecture-room, recitation room.
Workshop, bucket-shop, policy shop.
Handwork, metal-work, filigree work.

But, "Exceptions are rare combinations, and such as *for appearance' sake* would better be separated." (Is the compositor to be the judge of the rarity and the "appearance" of the compound?)

Again: "Compounds of 'store' should be hyphenated when the prefix contains only one syllable; otherwise not."

"Compounds of 'skin' with words of one syllable are to be printed as one word; with words of more than one, as two separate words."

"The particle 'non-' . . . ordinarily calls for a hyphen, except in the commonest words."

And the subject is closed with a list of thirty-two compounds described thus: "words of everyday occurrence which should be hyphenated, and which do not fall under any of the above classifications."

In the Riverside Press "Handbook," the attempt to formulate rules is frankly abandoned, in favor of a general reference to the International Dictionary.

[1] "Business house" is not a parallel case to the others.

Mr. Summey[1] expresses in a very few words the uncertainty that surrounds the subject: "Just what shall be hyphened has to be decided arbitrarily in part, because dictionaries and style books do not agree." He adds, cautiously, "According to careful American practice, the important classes of expressions which regularly *or usually* [italics ours] take the compounding hyphen are (1) compounds with *self* in which *self* is like an object and the other part like a verb, (2) compound numerals like *twenty-six*, (3) prepositional-phrase compounds like *son-in-law*, (4) adjectival compounds of words naming colors (*silver-gray* tone), (5) expressions in which the hyphen is necessary to clearness, as in *re-creation* (remaking) which without the hyphen might be confused with recreation, and (6) certain compounds beginning with *ex*, *pre*, *pro*, *ultra*, *quasi* (ex-governor, pre-Shakespearean, pro-German, quasi-compliment).[2] . . . Many words like *courthouse*, *footnote*, *by-product* are written either solid or hyphened. Choice in such cases will make little difference save on the score of uniformity."

Enough has been said to show that the best-intentioned efforts to reduce this subject to order

[1] *Modern Punctuation*, p. 175.

[2] Incidentally it may be remarked that Mr. Summey's own rules for the use of the semicolon would probably require that point instead of a comma before each of the numerals in this enumeration.

result only in rules riddled with exceptions, and arbitrary lists that reflect individual tastes — lists of which no two are alike.

The question as to the use or non-use of the hyphen with combinations of words arises in three ways.

1. Should the combination be printed as one word, or with a hyphen;

2. Should it be printed with a hyphen, or as two words; or

3. Should it be printed as one word or as two words.

Atlantic usage in this respect is in a fluid state, and we attempt no definite rules other than the following.

Under 1: —

(*a*) The prefixes *co*, *de*, *pre*, and *re*, do not take a hyphen except in those cases where the absence of a hyphen after *re* would convey a different meaning from that intended; as in "re-create," meaning to create anew, as distinguished from "recreate," to refresh or entertain; "re-form," to form anew, as distinguished from "reform" in its ordinary signification. When either of these prefixes is combined with a word beginning with the same vowel with which the prefix ends, a diæresis is placed over the second vowel; as *coördinate*, *preëmpt*, *reënter*, etc. The ordinary style of English printers, followed by many in America, is to

use the hyphen in cases that fall within the last category; as *co-operate*, *re-edit*, etc. Some printers also use the hyphen in the special form *re-read*, but in Atlantic usage it is omitted.

(*b*) Contrary to the practice of many offices, Atlantic usage still requires the hyphen in *to-day*, *to-night*, *to-morrow*. This practice is more or less traditional, and it is not altogether clear why these words do not stand on the same footing as "yesterday," which no one ever thinks of printing with a hyphen.[1]

(*c*) Prefixes ordinarily combined without a hyphen may be followed by that mark when it is desired to call attention to the distinction between the different meanings of the same word used with different prefixes: —

He draws a very sharp distinction between im-moral, un-moral, and a-moral.

The same purpose is perhaps more frequently indicated by the use of italics: —

He draws a very sharp distinction between *im*moral *un*moral, and *a*moral.

[1] "The forms *today*, *tonight*, *tomorrow* are alternative with *to-day*, *to-night*, *to-morrow*. The hyphened forms are more current in books and still current in some newspapers; the forms without hyphen are commonly used by newspapers and are used by some of the best book printers. The age and familiar use and the pronunciation of these words all suggest the solid form." — Summey, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

(*d*) Mr. Hart's rule, quoted above, that "a compound noun which has but one accent, *and from familiar use has become one word*, requires no hyphen," may perhaps be taken as a general guide, if the words we have italicized are omitted. But the question of the number of accents is rather a nice one for a compositor to decide, and, as we have said, the rule is by no means universal in its application.[1]

Under 2, we adopt the two rules of Mr. Hart mentioned above, but not quoted: —

(*a*) When an adverb modifies a predicate, the hyphen *should not* be used: as "this fact is well known."

(*b*) Where either (1) a noun and adjective or participle, or (2) an adjective and a noun, in combination, are used as a compound adjective, the hyphen *should* be used: "a poverty-stricken family," "a blood-red hand," "a nineteenth-century invention."

This last is not always easy of application, but it seems to us to be preferable to the cognate rule of the University of Chicago Press: "Hyphenate two or more words (except proper names forming a unity in themselves) combined into one adjective preceding a noun," because the latter is so comprehensive that it needs to be qualified by

[1] For example, *to-day*, *to-night*, and *to-morrow* have but one accent, yet Mr. Hart would print them with the hyphen.

excepting, not only the cases covered by Mr. Hart's rule (*a*), but also the following well-defined category: —

(*c*) Adverbs ending in *ly* should not be connected by a hyphen with the following words under any circumstances. For example, we say, "a well-read man," but, "a profoundly instructed student of biology."

(*d*) All the above are concerned with adjectival compounds. The subject of hyphenating compound nouns is even more difficult to deal with, and little more can be said than that the hyphen is ordinarily used if the first word of the compound is anything except an adjective. But the exceptions to this general statement are so numerous that it is impossible to call it a rule.

(*e*) Compounds of which "fellow" is the first element are always printed as two words: *fellow man*, *fellow citizens*, etc. This well-established Atlantic usage is opposed to the practice of all English and a great many American printers.

(*f*) The same may be said of compounds of which "tree" is the second element: these, also, we print always as two words: *apple tree*, *elm tree*.

Under 3: —

The following combinations, sometimes printed as two separate words (chiefly in England), but never, we believe, with a hyphen, are printed as single words in the "Atlantic": —

Anyone, *everyone*, *someone*,[1] and *forever*.

Charles Stuart Calverley recognized, albeit with regret, the tendency of the age, even in England, to adopt the joined form of the last-mentioned combination, at least, when he wrote: —

Forever! 'T is a single word!
  Our rude forefathers deemed it two.
Can you imagine so absurd
    A view?

Forever! What abysms of woe
  The word reveals, what frenzy, what
Despair! For ever (printed so)
    Did not.

. . . . . .

Forever! passion-fraught, it throws
  O'er the dim page a gloom, a glamour:
It 's sweet, it 's strange; and I suppose
    It 's grammar.

Forever! 'T is a single word!
  Our rude forefathers deemed it two;
Nor am I confident they erred;
    Are you?

On the other hand, *one's self* is preferred to *oneself*, the possessive form being the logical one, and the one adopted in the *self* forms of a majority of the other pronouns. *Myself*, *yourself*, *herself*, *ourselves*, *yourselves*, are possessives; *himself*, *itself*, and *themselves* are not.

[1] Equivalent to *anybody*, *everybody*, *somebody*. They are, of course, printed as two words when used with modifying phrases: "Any one of them will do"; "his words were be directed to every one of those present"; "will some one of you come forward?"

SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING RELATIVE PRONOUNS

I. "Who," "Which," or "That," with a Personal or Quasi-Personal Antecedent

1. *Who* (or *whom*) should be used when the antecedent is a person or persons, always in preference to *which*, and generally in preference to *that*, even in "defining" clauses.[1]

John Smith, *who* used to live in the next house [non-defining], is spoken of as the Republican candidate for governor.

The John Smith *who* is being groomed for the Republican nomination [defining] is John Smith of Skowhegan, *whom* I used to play with [non-defining] when I was a boy.

But within the limits of his vision there was no man *whom* Scott could call master [defining].

It was evident to her that he was one of the young squires bewitched *whom* beautiful women are constantly enlisting [defining].

It is sometimes necessary, however, to use *that* for *who* in a defining clause; as in the following example, the alternative being the impossible *who who*: —

[1] For the distinction between defining (or restrictive) and non-defining (non-restrictive) clauses, see pp. 113, 114 *supra*.

Oh! *who that* remembers Parsons and Dodd . . . in those two characters, etc.

2. When the antecedent is a collective noun, or noun of multitude, *which* should be used in non-defining and *that* in defining clauses, when the noun is referred to later by a singular pronoun, or by no pronoun at all, in which case the copula of the relative should be singular.[1]

The rabble, *which* always sees in public disorder *its* opportunity for plunder, flocked to the scene.

The crowd *that* is now surging about the entrance to these halls shows by *its* ominous silence that *it* is bent upon mischief.

But if the noun in question, though singular in form, is referred to by a pronoun of plural meaning, the proper relative, in all cases, is *who*, and its verb should be plural.

The audience, *who were* inclined to be panicky at first, being quieted by this assurance, remained in *their* seats.

The present government, *who have* shamefully mismanaged affairs from the beginning, will soon, we fervently hope, be deprived of the high offices that *they* dishonor.

The populace, *who are* always ready to applaud the noisiest demagogues, waved *their* hats, and shouted at the tops of *their* voices.

[1] See, further, under "Number," pp. 244–46, *infra*.

3. When the antecedent is an animate creature other than man, *who* should be used only when such creature is designated by a personal pronoun — "he" or "she" — or is referred to as if it were a human being, especially when some individual of the species is meant.

And so in the case of a being [a coati-mundi] who has received much more than *his* share of vitality, it was altogether fitting to shorten this name to Kib. — W. BEEBE.

Tedda Gabler, the bob-tailed mare, *who* throws up the dirt with *her* big hooves.[1] — KIPLING.

I led the way up the steps, and there in the doorway was a tenant, one *who* had already taken possession, and *who* now faced me, with that dignity . . . which only a toad, a giant *grandmother* of a toad, can exhibit. — W. BEEBE.

When Nature, or Fortune, personified, is the antecedent, *who* should be used.

In the case of a mixed antecedent, of persons and things, *that* is properly used for the relative.

The glimpse we have of the men and talents *that* the small nations can rally suggests that perhaps the incident is not yet closed.

There is in me an instant repulsion for the man or book *that* lightly uses, etc.

[1] From Kipling's story, "A Walking Delegate," in *The Day's Work*. In other stories printed in the same volume, — "The Ship that Found Herself" and "007," — inanimate objects are similarly personified.

II. Whom used for Who

This error is much more frequent in newspaper writing than elsewhere, but is to be found in the work of writers who, one would think, must know better. It occurs generally when another clause, including a verb, is placed between the relative and the verb of which it is the subject, the writer being misled apparently by the impression that the relative is the object of the nearer verb in the subordinate clause.

It is only those converted by the Gospel *whom* we pretend are influenced by it.

Those *whom* it was originally pronounced would be allowed to go.

We feed children *whom* we think are hungry.

The above examples, given in "The King's English" (page 93), are taken from periodicals — the second from the *Spectator!*

Mr. Dombey, *whom* he now began to perceive was as far beyond human recall. — DICKENS.

. . . people *whom* he decided should be invited to the Shrubberies. — P. L. FORD.

A companion *whom* I knew could only be his brother. — CONAN DOYLE.

Here the archæologist hands over the search to the anthropologist and palæontologist, *whom* he finds have been working from the other end. — VERNON KELLOGG.

In his speech declaring the recent session of a Congress at an end, the Speaker is reported by the "Congressional Record" to have said: —

Particularly do I appreciate how much is due to the kindness and generosity of the minority leader . . . and to his lieutenant, Mr. Kitchin, whose ill health we regret, but *whom* we all sincerely hope will be with us next session, etc.

Another, less frequent, error is the use of *who* for *whom;* as when Gratiano says in the *Merchant of Venice:* —

I have a wife *who*, I protest, I love.

III. Than Whom — Than Which

Beelzebub, *than whom*, Satan except, none higher sat. — MILTON.

Expand, being *than which* none else is perhaps more spiritual. — WHITMAN.

This device, we judge, was peculiar to Mrs. Carter, *than whom* a less eager student would have congratulated herself, etc. — R. BERGENGREN.

All the centuries between Milton and Bergengren are full of examples of the persistent use of this expression, although it is manifestly wrong. On the other hand, "than who" is impossible; so that the only way to avoid the difficulty in the interest of good English is to recast the sentence. But, as the authors of "The King's English" say,

"Perhaps the convenience of *than whom* is so great that to rule it out amounts to saying that man is made for grammar and not grammar for man."[1] Cobbett's remarks on this subject are interesting as affording an excellent specimen of his method of combining instruction with a whack at his enemies.

"There is, however, an erroneous way of employing *whom* which I must point out to your particular attention, because it is so often seen in very good writers, and because it is very deceiving. 'The duke of Argyle, than whom no man was more hearty in the cause. Cromwell, than whom no man was better skilled in artifice.' A hundred such phrases might be collected from Hume, Blackstone, and even from Doctors Blair and Johnson. Yet they are bad grammar. In all such cases, *who* should be made use of:[2] for,[3] it is nominative and not objective. . . . It is a very common parliament-house phrase, and therefore presumptively corrupt:[4] but it is Doctor Johnson's phrase, too: 'Pope, *than whom* few men had more vanity.' The Doctor did not say, 'Myself, *than whom* few men have been found more base, having, in my Dictionary, described a pensioner as a

[1] Page 64.
[2] How? one wonders.
[3] He gives no rule which would authorize this comma.
[4] With this colon, again he violates his own rule.

slave of state, and having afterwards myself become a pensioner.'"[1]

IV. The "And Which" Construction

And which, but which, but whose, and whose, and who, etc., are sometimes so used as to suggest coördination with a preceding relative clause that does not exist. If the preceding clause is *equivalent* to a relative clause, the coördination is proper, although the connective is often unnecessary; when the preceding clause is not so equivalent, or when it can be made so only by changing its construction, the so-called "and which" construction is wrong.

[The Great Seal] of Great Britain was offered me last week by Lord Grenville and Mr. Fox, *but which* for several reasons . . . I declined. — LORD ELLENBOROUGH.

Here there is no true coördination; he should have written, "but for several reasons . . . I declined it."

In order to give color of reasonableness to this species of appropriation, the languages taught by the possessors are called the "learned languages," *and which* appellation is, at the same time, etc. — COBBETT.

[1] *English Grammar*, edition of 1906, p. 106. He goes on to deal with a defense of the expression, by Bishop Lowth, based on its use by Milton, "who," says Cobbett, "has committed many hundreds, if not thousands of grammatical errors, many of which the Bishop himself has pointed out."

Commas are made use of when phrases, that is to say, portions of words are throwed[1] into a sentence, *and which* are not absolutely necessary to assist in its grammatical construction. — COBBETT.

In the first of these two sentences the "and" is clearly superfluous; in the second, "but," or "although they," might be substituted for the indefensible *and which*.

But through it all, Mr. President, his ceaseless vigilance and his enduring service have fully justified the confidence of the people of Oregon, consisting of an overwhelming preponderance of political opponents, *but who*, nevertheless, for the last 20 years, as governor and as Senator, have availed themselves of his services, and have kept him at the helm of public affairs. — *Congressional Record*.

The clause beginning with "consisting of" should be recast. One can hardly say, "the people of Oregon, who consist of . . . ," and "the people of Oregon which consists . . ." would require "but which," instead of *but who*. "The people of Oregon, among whom his political opponents are in a large majority, but who," etc., would be more grammatical. Incidentally, we may remark that "as governor and as Senator" should be placed after "services." As it stands, "the people of Oregon . . . as governor and as Senator," have availed themselves, etc.

[1] See *English Grammar*, pp. 61, 62, for Cobbett's defense of his use of "throwed," "drawed," and other similar forms.

What the Chair has been ruling, *and to which* the solicitors of certain departments . . . are objecting, is that, etc. — *Congressional Record.*

The mere omission of the superfluous *and* would be less emphatic than to say "and what the solicitors . . . are objecting to."

In the next examples, the first clause is equivalent to a relative clause of the same type as that which follows, and the construction is right.

Suppose then a gentleman of unknown fortune [the amount of whose fortune is unknown], *but whose* wealth was to be conjectured from the fact that he spent two thousand a year on his park-walls and footmen only, professes himself fond of science; and that,[1] etc. — RUSKIN.

Associated with this wonderful mechanism of the animal body, we have phenomena [which are] no less certain than those of physics, *but* between *which* and the mechanism we discern, etc. — TYNDALL.

Here is a body of thought, feeling, character, experience, [which is] fluid and vast as all the seas, *and whose* tide is the movement within it of the Eternal Spirit. — GEORGE A. GORDON. (The "and" is unnecessary.)

It is a case of the conflict of two self-systems in a personality [which had been] up to that time heterogeneously divided, *but* in *which*, after the conversion-crisis, etc. — W. JAMES.

[1] Having omitted "that" after "Suppose then," the author should have omitted this "that" also. See p. 261 *infra*. But it would have been much better not to omit it in the first clause.

Whatever our beliefs or disbeliefs, here is a very noble and beautiful spirit, a very fine and lofty courage, to be [which should be] reverentially admired of all men, *and which* can never be out of fashion. — H. C. LODGE.

This subject is discussed at great length, and most thoroughly, in "The King's English,"[1] and the distinction between "open coördination," "latent coördination," and "insubordination" is illustrated by numerous examples, which emphasize the authors' demonstration of the carelessness, almost slovenliness, of those who would naturally be regarded as the "best writers." No attempt is made here to do more than treat the matter in the simplest possible way; but this single example of "insubordination," of which no less eminent a writer than Thackeray was guilty, may find a place.

They marched into the apartment where the banquet was served; *and which*, as I have promised the reader he shall enjoy it, he shall have the privilege of ordering himself.

The *which*, of course, refers to "banquet"; but the coördination is with "where," that is to say, the reader may order the apartment for himself.

V. "That" as a Relative

"*That* is evidently regarded by many writers as an ornamental variation for *who* and *which*, to be

[1] Pages 85 *ff.*

used, not indeed immoderately, but quite without distinction. The opinion is excusable; it is not easy to draw any distinction that is at all supported by usage. There was formerly a tendency to use *that* for everything; the tendency now is to use *who* and *which* for everything. *That* from disuse has begun to acquire an archaic flavor, which with some authors is a recommendation."[1]

The justice of the first sentence quoted above is abundantly confirmed in the present writer's mind by his examination of the manuscripts which pass through his hands; but he can find little evidence of the tendency to use *who* and *which* for everything. His experience leads him to believe that very few writers have in mind any line of distinction between *that* and *which*. Some apparently dislike the one, and some the other; and it is the purpose in this place simply to suggest one or two principles that govern, or are meant to govern, the "editing" and proof-reading of "Atlantic" articles, and of Atlantic books so far as it is left to editorial discretion.

1. *That* should never be used in a non-defining relative clause, as it is in the first two examples following.

It is an astounding fact, *that* [which] his University must explain, that he, with his great abilities, etc.

[1] *The King's English*, p. 80.

One's first impression is that "that" is a conjunction, introducing the "astounding fact."

She spoke of it tolerantly, just naming it in a simple sentence, *that* [which] fell with a ring and chimed. — MEREDITH.

In the next example, also of a non-defining clause, *which* is properly used.

He reflected passingly on the instinctive push of her rich and sparkling voluble fancy to the initiative, *which* women do not like in a woman, and men prefer to distantly admire.[1] — MEREDITH.

2. *That* should generally be used in defining clauses, that is, in those which so limit the application of the antecedent that they are essential to the meaning.

In every novel of Balzac's . . . there are the great intentions *that* fructify and the great intentions *that* fail. — H. JAMES.

It is the inexorable clock *that* says she is as other women. — MEREDITH.

It's a disease *that* don't attack short-haulers, as a rule. — KIPLING.

When my work brings me in touch with a genuine book-lover, a connoisseur of all *that* is included in the word "book."

From a rhetorical standpoint, this use of *that* is more fitting, there being no pause before the relative in a defining clause, and *that* being, under

[1] Meredith was rather addicted to the split infinitive.

such circumstances, more euphonious — or "easier to say" — than *which*. For instance, the following sentence would be improved by substituting *that* for *which* in both clauses.

The animals *which* existed would be the ancestors of those *which* now live. — HUXLEY.

Exceptions to this rule, if, indeed, it can be called a rule, are too numerous to admit of any really satisfactory classification.

(*a*) As *that* has no possessive case, *whose* must always be used when the relative is in that case.

The one book *whose* pages should be conned and conned again by every Christian.

(*b*) As the relative *that* cannot follow a preposition, *which* must always be used in that connection.

The club *with which* the crime was committed was hidden under the church steps.

In the next example, the second relative clause, like the first, is defining.

When it lets itself loose among the old social types *that* vegetate in silent corners of provincial towns, and *of which* an old and complex civilization, passing from phase to phase, leaves everywhere so thick a deposit, etc. — H. JAMES.

NOTE. — The question whether a relative clause is defining or non-defining can often, but by no means always, be answered by applying the test of dropping the pronoun (but only when it is in the objective case [see page 225]); this can generally be done in a defining clause, but cannot be tolerated in a non-

defining one. We can say, "The man he saw yesterday proved to be John Smith"; but not "John Smith, he saw yesterday, died this morning." To make the last intelligible, "whom" must be supplied after "Smith."

(*c*) The use of *that* rather than *which* in defining clauses is more or less awkward,

(1) When the relative is widely separated from its antecedent.

The professor then proceeded with the particular experiment — one demanding the most meticulous care — *which* he expected to be decisive of his theory.

As the relative clause is defining, *that* would be preferable but for the parenthetical clause.

The question of awkwardness in this connection is complicated by a further possibility of ambiguity where a defining clause intervenes between the antecedent and a second relative clause, which may or may not be defining.

But in the following examples the distinction between defining and non-defining clauses is clearly marked by the use of *that* and *which* respectively.

Are you . . . sure . . . that the coiling shadow, *which* disquiets itself in vain, cannot change into the smoke of the torment *that* ascends forever? — RUSKIN.

How the world needs the wisdom, *which* no learning can give, *that* sees the vanity and shallowness of narrow partisanship and jingoism, of creeds *that* conceal more than they reveal, of social shams *that* often veil corruptions, and the inanity of the money-hunt *that*

monopolizes the energies of our entire civilization! — LOWES DICKINSON.

(2) When the relative is separated from its copula.

It never seems to occur to the parents that there may be an education *which*, in itself, *is* advancement in Life. — RUSKIN.

These are the hills, and these the bays and blue inlets *which*, among the Greeks, *would have been* always loved — RUSKIN.

. . . and to the contemporary calamity *which*, were it rightly mourned by her, *would occur* no more hereafter. — RUSKIN.

Many of these are to be found in "L'Histoire de ma Vie," a work *which*, although it was thought disappointing at that time of its appearance, *is* well worth reading. — H. JAMES.

(3) When the relative stands in close proximity to other *thats* (whether conjunctive or demonstrative pronouns). The simplest example is found in the very common combination *that which*.

The nation now has to face a condition almost identical with *that which* existed at the close of the Civil War.

Is it to be thought that *that which* has brought the mind so greatly into play has had no effect on the mind itself? — SIR M. FOSTER.

A few further examples will give some idea of the wide scope of this exception.

With all the zest *which that* dream had engendered, he was hunting thro' Petrograd for a wilted potato.

I sometimes found myself wondering whether there can be any popular religion raised on the ruins of the old Christianity without the presence of *that* element *which* in the past, etc.

Before continuing the story of that movement, however, we must allude briefly to *that* portion of the European frontier *which* lay northward of the Puritan settlements, and *which*, etc.

The result he reaches is that students do not know the world *which* lies about them, and that they are taught to answer quite glibly academic questions of a decidedly erudite character.

Read this with *that* substituted for *which:* one instinctively mistakes for a moment the conjunction *that* immediately following for another relative in the same construction as the first one.

In the next example, the *that* standing in a defining clause, although quite proper, might well be changed to *which*, as it causes a momentary hesitation at the second *that*, as to whether it is not a relative, with "belief" as its antecedent.

This results, in part, from a lingering of the patriotic fervor *that* floated the Liberty Loans, and in part from a wholesome belief that punishment inexorably attends, etc.

In support of what was said a few pages back to the effect that few writers have in mind any

special distinction between *that* and *which*, we quote, from three of the most eminent modern authors, passages in which the two pronouns are used quite indiscriminately in precisely the same construction — all in what we have callled "defining" clauses.

All the toys *that* infatuate men and *which* they play for, — houses, land, money, etc. — EMERSON.

The mysteries and scenery of the cave had the same dignity *that* belongs to all natural objects, and *which* shames the fine things to which we foppishly compare them. . . . We shot Bengal lights into the vaults and groins of the starry cathedrals, and examined all the masterpieces *which* the four combined engineers, water, limestone, gravitation, and time, could make in the dark. — EMERSON.

Every particle *that* enters into the comparison of a muscle, a nerve, or a tone has been placed in its position by molecular force. . . . Our difficulty is not with the quality of the problem, but with its complexity; and this difficulty might be met by the simple expansion of the faculties *which* we now possess. — TYNDALL.

It is remarkable how little of a merely local and temporary character, how little of those scoriæ *which* a reader has to clear away before he gets to the precious ore, how little *that* even admits of doubt or question, the morality of Marcus Aurelius exhibits. In general, the action he prescribes is action *which* every sound nature must recognize as right, and the motives he assigns are motives *that* every clear reason must recognize as valid. — ARNOLD.

In a brief book-review, by an experienced writer, we find the following paragraphs illustrative of the same indifference.

By common consent it is something *that* the world ought to be made safe for.

No new doctrines are expounded here, nor, indeed, are we entitled to look for novelties in a field *which* has been so diligently ploughed by political philosophers for more than twenty centuries.

They are the work of a master-hand *that* has not lost its cunning.

The shrewd observations . . . the deftness in picking out the things *that* really count, etc.

This at times gives the reader an impression of superficiality, especially in the chapters *which* deal with the government of the U.S.

It is risking very little, however, to venture the prediction that Lord Bryce's book will quickly gain and hold recognition as the most sensible and lucid exposition of modern democracy *that* the shelves of our libraries contain.

In the next, rather extraordinary, passage Lord Dunsany seems to have reverted to the "ancient" tendency noted by "The King's English," "to use *that* for everything"; and even so, he has omitted several conjunctive *thats*, supplied in brackets.

They say [that] a barrel-organ played quite near them; they say [that] a coster was singing; they admit *that* he was singing out of tune; they admit a cockney accent; and yet they say *that that* song had in it something *that* no earthly song had ever had before; and

both men say *that* they would have wept, but *that* there was a feeling about their heart-strings *that* was far too deep for tears. They believe *that* the longings of this masterful man, who was able to rule a safari by a glance of his eye, and could terrify natives without raising a hand, had been so strong at the last *that* it had impressed itself deeply upon nature, and had caused a mirage *that* may not fade wholly away, perhaps, for several years.

(4) If, in the second of two parallel defining clauses in the same sentence, the use of *which* rather than *that* is indicated, it is better to use *which* in the first one also.

A kindness *that* [which] made every man his friend, and a courtesy *which*, even in a time when men lifted their hats to men as well as to women, had gained for him the sobriquet of "Gentleman George." — HOPKINSON SMITH.

We have already seen the results of the administrative confusion, in the opportunity *which* it gave the New England colonies, and of *which* they made full use. — J. T. ADAMS.

VI. Omission of the Relative

With regard to the not infrequent omission of the relative, briefly referred to above, it should perhaps be repeated, for emphasis, that such omission is possible (1) only in defining clauses, and (2) in those, only when the relative, if present, would be in the objective case, with or without a preposition.

It is properly enough omitted in these three examples: —

He was the only student I have ever had, of whose criticism I felt afraid.

The late Senator was a man nobody ever could quarrel with.

Stretching long fingers with disks like cymbals, reaching out for the land she had never trod, limbs flexed for leaps she had never made. — BEEBE.

But in the next two, where, in each case, the omitted pronoun is the subject, the omission is altogether wrong.

I cannot see why the Senate should undertake to direct the Federal Reserve Board by language which no one can understand and [which] will not tend to secure, etc. — *Congressional Record.*

But the pearl pendant, which her husband had given her . . . and [which] now oscillated with the movement of the carriage, etc. — E. F. BENSON.

The next example shows the distinction clearly, the *object* relative being omitted before "he saved," whereas the *subject* relative *that*, before "was lost," cannot be spared.

He is enshrined there on the bridge . . . an image of ultimate resistance, so intense . . . that his astral . . . must still patrol the course of the steamer he saved, or of the steamer *that* was lost.

It may be said further that, if it is omitted in

the first of two or more parallel clauses, in which the construction is unchanged, it is better to omit it in all.

But the Devil I do recognize, and *that* I wish to illustrate here, etc.

This is illogical; the first "that" being omitted, the other is better away. And even if "that" were supplied after "Devil," the sentence would be more flexible without the second "that I."

That the distinction between defining and non-defining clauses was undreamed of in Cobbett's day, not in name only, but in theory, is evident from his remark: "'Which,' as a relative pronoun, is applied to irrational beings only, and, as to those beings, it may be employed indifferently with 'that,' except where a relative comes directly after a verb or a preposition."[1] But in his search for illustrations of the improper use of "that" instead of "who" or "whom," he unearthed two curious passages in Hume.

The queen gave orders for taking into custody the Duke of Northumberland, *who* fell on his knees to the Earl of Arundel, *that* arrested him.

Douglas, *who* had prepared his people, and *that* was bent upon taking his part openly.

It is difficult to classify the following examples of misuse or misplacement of relatives.

[1] *English Grammar*, p. 108.

I write this at the James Bryces', *who* have taken the Merrimans' house for the summer, and *whither* I came the day before yesterday.

The first relative treats "the Bryces" as persons, and the second, "whither," as a place.

Could we forecast the future with the same accuracy *that* [with which] astronomers do the movements of the orbs.

Notably a pool known as the Princess's, so called after the royal lady as a compliment, to whom the Quebec Government had ceded the fishing rights to her husband.

The last sentence appeared in a recent magazine, over the name of a famous statesman, who was once leader of a great political party, and who has been Viceroy of India and Governor-General of Canada!

Madame de Lanel was an acquaintance Miss Cass had made a couple of years previous on a Mediterranean liner, who, at that time had been a Miss Edith Doelger.

VII. Whoever [Whosoever], Whomever [Whomsoever]

The fact that these words stand "for anyone *who*," or some similar phrase, is presumably overlooked by those persons who mistakenly use the accusative for the nominative in such sentences as the following: —

A most unjust law . . . was that which provided that any native found drunk should have to labor twelve days for *whomever* accused him and proved the case.

The error is so common that it must be familiar to everyone. It is due, of course, to the fact that the word, in most cases, immediately follows a preposition, and to failure to reflect that the *relative* portion of the word is the *subject* of the verb.

COMMON PARTS

UNDER this heading "The King's English" discusses certain types of erroneous construction growing out of the desire to avoid the repetition of words common to two sentences connected by a conjunction. In such cases the rule is stated to be that "a word that is not common to both sentences must not be treated as common; and one that is common, and whose position declares that it is meant to do double duty, must not be repeated."[1] This rule is most frequently violated in sentences of which the following are types.

Have you had relief from your miserable suffering state? or has it gone on as badly or worse than ever?

He maintained that [the guilty man] whose guilt was known only to himself might well suffer in his conscience as much, if not more, than he whose guilt was known to all the world.

In some respects Napoleon appears in the light of history to be as great a man if not greater than Cromwell.

Congress has done for Labor all and more than could be expected of it.

[1] Page 314. The subject has long been in the writer's mind, but he again acknowledges his indebtedness to Messrs. Fowler, for giving a name to this problem, and a succinct definition.

In all four examples, "than" is treated as if it were common to both clauses, although in each of the first three "as," and in the fourth "that," is required to complete the sense of the first. "Has it gone on as badly [as], or worse than ever?" "Might well suffer . . . as much [as], if not more than," etc. "To be as great a man [as], if not greater than, Cromwell." "Congress has done all [that] and more than could be expected," etc. To supply the missing word in such cases often imparts an unpleasant stiffness to the style; but this can generally be avoided by a slight change in the construction. "Has it gone on as badly as ever, or worse?" "To be as great a man as Cromwell, if not greater." "Has done all that could be expected of it, and more."

The next three sentences are less easily made grammatical.

Wisdom and experience taught him to trust as much or more to the diplomatic handling of a situation than to a strict enforcement of the law.

It is not that it merely makes life safer, but saner and longer.

Schools of the progressive type have been conducted long enough to prove that just as much or even more than the average amount of the *a b c's* can be acquired, etc.

The last is a particularly bad construction; it should be changed to read ". . . to prove that the average amount, or even more, of the *a b c's*."

One of the first, if not the first, mystery stories based on the possibilities of the modern air-ship.

"Stories" is treated as if it were common to both clauses; whereas "story" is the word required to be supplied in the subordinate one. This type can generally be amended by some such change as: "One of the first mystery stories based . . . if not the very first"; or by adopting the form used by Macaulay in

. . . and was still among the greatest, if not the greatest, of the nobles of Scotland.

Another frequent violation of the rule given above occurs in such sentences as

What other President ever has, or could, achieve so much in a short four years?

It had, as all houses should, been in tune with the pleasant, mediocre charm of the island.

In these the rule is violated in each case by treating the verb ("achieve" and "been") as if it were common to both clauses, whereas the different auxiliaries used in the two clauses require different forms of the verb.

This type will almost always admit of the emphatic repetition of the verb.[1] "What other President ever has achieved, or could achieve," etc. "It had been, as all houses should be, . . ."

[1] *The King's English*, p. 315.

. . . just men and women with whom I had less personal relations, and knew only as representatives of the animal species man.

This is written as if the common part were "just men and women with whom I"; in which case the sense would be ". . . *with whom* I had . . . relations, and *with* whom I knew." But "just men and women" — nothing more — is common; so we should read "Just men and women with whom . . . and *whom* I knew," etc.

In the two examples that follow, the rule is carefully observed, the result in the second case being a somewhat over-labored sentence.

. . . in these similarities the biologist finds convincing proof of man's origin from, and definite relation to, other forms of life. — VERNON KELLOGG.

Of all the branches of science, none perhaps is to-day, none for these many years past has been, so well known to, even if not understood by, most people, as that of geology. — SIR M. FOSTER.

The following curious example of how not to do it falls within no conceivable classification.

Her choice of Ireland for the "avenue" was partly her own, but — though they were wise enough to conceal it from her — in greater measure by her parents.

This might be made intelligible by changing the final clause to — "was due in greater measure to her parents"; or simply by changing "by her

parents" to "her parents'" (possessive); or, again, by changing the first clause to read "was made partly by herself."

In such passages as the following, the question arises whether, in the one case, *not*, in the other case, *no*, is properly followed by *nor*.

It is *not* allowed to diminish in numbers, *nor* to exceed, etc. — EMERSON.

Will any answer that they are sure of it, and that there is *no* fear, *nor* hope, *nor* desire, *nor* labor . . . whither they go? — RUSKIN.

In the first example, the part common to both branches of the sentence is, "It is not allowed"; that it is to say: "It is not allowed to diminish in numbers, *nor* [it is not allowed] to exceed," etc. So that in effect, the use of *nor* results in a double negative, which is, in principle though not in sound, as objectionable as "There is n't no time to do it."

In the second example, the part common to all the branches of the sentence is "there is no": "there is no fear, nor [there is no] hope, nor [there is no] desire," etc. And again we have the double negative.[1]

[1] In both examples, of course, the use of "neither" would make "nor" obligatory. "It is allowed neither to diminish . . . nor," etc.; "Will any answer . . . that there is neither fear, nor hope, nor desire," etc.

(In the sentence from "The Scarlet Letter," quoted in another connection on page 87, Hawthorne carelessly used both *or* and *nor* in a construction similar to these. According to our rule, *or* should have been used in both cases; but, from any standpoint, the change from *or* to *nor* cannot be justified.)

Whence we derive the rule that where a negative clause, with either *not* or *no*, is followed by a disjunctive introducing another clause in the same construction, *or* should be used rather than *nor*.

The same rule should be applied logically to the next example.

Shakespeare did *not* invent the alphabet, the words, the syntax, the validity and power of the English language; *nor* the English nation [did not invent] its ways of thinking, its achievements, its character, *nor* [it did not invent] the comedy and tragedy of human life. — RUSKIN.

In this case, it may be said that, if we assume a change of construction, — "*nor* did the English nation invent its ways of thinking . . . *nor* did it invent the comedy and tragedy of human life," — both *nors* are right. This is quite true; but when *or* would be both logical and unobjectionable in both places, there is no occasion to depart from the rule which provides that, when the construction is changed, no words that are necessary to indicate the change may be omitted.

The criticism is equally just if we have been led by the absence of any punctuation after "nation" to mistake Ruskin's meaning, which may have been that Shakespeare did not invent the English nation, etc.

These examples are to be distinguished from such sentences as the following, in which the *nor*, besides serving as a connective, supplies the negative necessary to complete the sense.

No one could say why it was that his food did not nourish him, nor his unspoken philosophy of life any longer cover the needs of his nature. — J. J. CHAPMAN.

The "common part" here is: "No one could say why it was that — not"; and the *nor*, standing for *or . . . not*, does away with the necessity of repeating *not* as well as a portion of the common part. If *or* be substituted for *nor*, we must say: "No one could say why it was that his food did not nourish him, or that his unspoken philosophy of life *did not* any longer cover (or "no longer covered") the needs," etc.

Correlatives

Both . . . and.
Either . . . or.
Neither . . . nor.
Not (*not only*, *simply*, *merely*, etc.) . . . *but* (*but also*, etc.).

"All words that precede the first of two correlatives are declared by their position to be common"[1] to both of the words, phrases, or sentences introduced by the correlatives. It follows that all words common to both, and no others, should precede the first correlative. All the following examples violate this rule.

The mistake was not confined to Europe, and the confusion of thought which it implies, *both* as to science *and* civilization, was world-wide. — H. C. LODGE

Both should be placed after "as to," or "as to" should be repeated after *and*.

Yet, in spite of the truth of this statement, European nations have acted as if it were *both* international law, *and* as if it were generally accepted.

The phrase "as if it were," being a part of what comes before the first correlative (*both*), should not be repeated before *and;* if it is to be repeated, *both* should follow "acted."

And is the only proper correlative of *both*.

"Which" differs from "that" and "who" in being used both as an adjective *as well as* a noun.

Aside from the doubtful accuracy of the statement, the example illustrates the awkwardness of using "as well as" in this connection; for if the construction were made otherwise unobjection-

[1] *The King's English*, p. 315.

able by omitting *both*, it would still require another "as": ". . . in being used as an adjective as well as *as* a noun."

Fifty per cent of the regiment received *either* decorations or were mentioned in despatches.

"Regiment" is the last of the words common to both clauses, and *either* should follow it immediately: "*either* received decorations or were," etc.

That, however, was a matter of which *either* the Crusader was ignorant, *or* incapable of grasping.

As "of which" does not "fit" with "grasping," it is not common to both correlative clauses. We must say, "a matter which the Crusader was *either* ignorant of, *or* incapable of grasping"; or, "which the Crusader *either* was ignorant of, *or* was incapable of grasping."

He could *neither* make up his mind to confess what he had done, *nor* to court exposure by flight.

"He could make up his mind" is common to both correlative clauses; therefore *neither* should follow it.

Cloth of gold *neither* seems to elate, *nor* cloth of frieze to depress him.

This can hardly be made right except by changing the tense ("He seems *neither* to be elated by cloth of gold *nor* depressed by cloth of frieze"), un-

less "neither" is changed to "not": "cloth of gold seems not to elate, nor," etc.

President Harding, therefore, will have to find some compromise that will *not only* be equally acceptable to Borah . . . *but* one that will go far enough from the stand of the Irreconcilables to tease eight votes away from the Democrats. — *Newspaper.*

"President Harding . . . that will" is common to both the correlative sentences; therefore "one that," should be omitted, the following "will" being allowed to remain for euphony's sake. If "not only" were placed before "some compromise," "one that" would be justified; but the other construction is less awkward.

I think this Congress can well set the example, and do whatever it can properly so to limit and restrict *not only* these initial expenses, but to set its face against additional expenditures we are going to be asked to meet. — *Congressional Record.*

"Example" ends what is common to both clauses; the sentence should be made to read: ". . . example, and *not only* do whatever . . . *but* set its face," etc.

We have to consider it, moreover, *not simply* in the abstract, as the return of a once hated feudal principle, *but* some of the already present concrete consequences of its adoption.

The sentence needs to be rewritten: "We have to consider *not only* the fact that, in the abstract,

it is a return . . . *but* some," etc. Or: "We have not simply to consider it in the abstract . . . but to consider," etc. Or, and perhaps better, insert "in the light of" after *but:* "We have to consider it not simply in the abstract . . . but in the light of some," etc.

We have to consider *not merely* dragons' teeth sown, *but* already coming up.

"Dragons' teeth" being included in what is common, *not merely* should follow, not precede it. But the sentence is an awkward one, at best.

And in your little American valise and my flabby black hand-bag and shawl-straps and a small satchel, I carried *not only* everything I used, *but* collected a whole library of books, etc. — W. JAMES.

"I" is the last of the words common to both correlative sentences, and *not only* should follow it immediately: "I *not only* carried . . . *but* collected," etc.

As in Massachusetts no churches were allowed except such as partook of the "New England way," it followed that *not only* were those who could not join them politically disfranchised, *but* that they and their children were cut off from the advantages of Christian fellowship and education.

The common part ends with "it followed"; therefore, *not only* should be placed before "that," and the following sentence be so changed as to

read "not only that those who could not join them were . . . disfranchised."

Failing that, however, they were *not only* debarred from Christian communion . . . *but* their children were also denied baptism, etc.

Not only should follow the only common words, "Failing that, however"; euphony then calls for the transposition of "they" and "were."

The result proved that never in the history of Philadelphia had a series [of lectures] been given in which *not only* had the interest been sustained, *but* had constantly deepened. — EDWARD BOK.

So far as the correlatives are concerned, the difficulty is easily cured — by changing "not only had the interest" to "the interest not only had"; but the author has made himself offer the astonishing statement that the result of this particular series proved that no series had ever before aroused a sustained and deepening interest in Philadelphia! The presumption is that he intended to write "so" before "sustained" and before "constantly."

Neither is sometimes, but always incorrectly, used with *or* as its correlative.

The truth is, of course, that *neither* Republicanism *or* [nor] Democracy, in its traditional expression, etc.

There is *neither* right *nor* wrong — gratitude *or* [nor] its opposite — claim *or* [nor] duty — paternity *or* [nor] sonship.

NUMBER

I. Of Verbs

THE verb should always agree in number with its subject.

There are several classes of cases in which it is important to bear this simple rule in mind.

1. When the subject is singular and its complement is plural, or *vice versa*.

The *curse* of the country *is* the profligacy, the rapacity, the corruption of the law-makers, the base subserviency of the administrators of the law, and the frauds of the makers of paper money.[1]

And yet I thought that a mind that could talk me blind and black on mathematics and logics, and whose favorite *recreation is* works on those subjects, etc. — W. JAMES.

The first *fruits* of his secularization *was* [were] an engagement upon the boards of Old Drury. — LAMB.

But *that which* most concerns us here *are* [is] not the economic conditions, etc. — H. C. LODGE. (The solecism here is made more glaring by the singular verb "concerns" in the subordinate clause.)

In life *it is* variety and pleasure which relieve the irksomeness of the steady grind.

[1] Cobbett manufactured this sentence, in pursuance of his general plan to air his views of the state of the country while illustrating his point.

The only *thing* that I noticed in the whole show *were* [was] the decorations of the hall.

Emerson, who, as we have had occasion to notice in another connection, was sometimes capable of peculiar — to say the least — constructions, perpetrated this in his essay on Civilization: —

The *Chinese and Japanese*, though each complete in his way, *is* different from the man of Madrid or the man of New York.

2. When a subordinate clause, or phrase, with a singular noun comes between a plural subject and its verb, or *vice versa*.

Our growing *population* with its higher standards of living *demand* [demands] increasing food-supplies.

The *partition* which the two ministers made of the powers of government *were* [was] singularly happy. — MACAULAY.

And withal our *pretension* of property and even of self-hood *are* [is] fading with the rest. — EMERSON.

There is *much* in these constant criminations and recriminations which *disgust* [disgusts] many men who are still hesitating as to the vote they shall cast. (The antecedent of "which" is "much," not "criminations and recriminations.")

This point is illustrated "abundantly" by the Messrs. Fowler,[1] because "it appears that real doubt can exist on the subject," a reviewer of the first edition of their book having remarked that

[1] *The King's English*, p. 66.

a sentence of theirs, "'No one but schoolmasters and schoolboys knows' is exceedingly poor English, if it is not absolutely bad grammar."

If two or more nouns can fairly be considered as together expressing a single idea, a singular verb may be used with them.

The *nobility and loftiness* of his style *is* apparent in every line.

3. With collective nouns, or "nouns of multitude."[1]

The list of such nouns is long, and seems to be capable of indefinite expansion, so as to include any word that represents the association of two or more persons; those of more or less common occurrence are "people," "public," "crowd," "nation," "ministry," "cabinet," "committee," "corporation," "class," "generation"; and the noun "number" itself, which is almost invariably treated as a plural.

The following examples will give a still imperfect idea of the scope of this category.

The policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the *Government* of India *are* in full accord, etc. — MORLEY.

[1] "Nouns of numbers, or multitude, such as Mob, Parliament, Rabble, House of Commons, Regiment, Court of King's Bench, Den of Thieves, and the like." — COBBETT, ed. of 1906, p. 96. Observe that he places Parliament between "Mob" and "Rabble," with the House of Commons next in order.

Nor should the 4LL be confused with the so-called "*shop-committee*" plan, in which a *group* of employees *are* elected, etc.

Amid the joyous *troop* who *give* in to the charivari comes now and then a sad-eyed boy. — EMERSON.

The *mass* of mankind *have* neither force of intellect enough to apprehend them . . . nor force of character enough to follow them. — ARNOLD.

The *bulk* of mankind *believe* in two gods. — EMERSON.

. . . the comfortable assurance that, although the *bulk* of her neighbors *were* going to hell, he himself was one of the everlasting saints.

The *whole* of these proceedings *were* so agreeable to Mr. Pecksniff, that he stood with his eyes fixed upon the floor, etc. — DICKENS.

The *country meet* the event [Washington's refusal to accept a third term] with reluctance; but *they* do not feel, etc. — OLIVER WOLCOTT, quoted in Irving's "Washington."

To-day it *is* the Zionist *portion* of this remnant, *who*, in the statement . . . *claim* the whole of southern Syria. — A. T. CLAY.

In America, where there *is* a large unassimilated foreign *element*, to *whom* the history and traditions of our language suggest little of value.

In the following example, the use of *are* is justified because the actual subject is "95," not "per cent," the meaning being "95 in every hundred."

It is a bit hard to admit that your child is an average child; but 95 per cent *are* average, and always will be.

The word *people* is treated, perhaps, less frequently as a singular noun than any other of its class, even when used as equivalent to "populace," or in the more distinctly singular sense of "nation." But occasionally we find it properly used with the singular verb, as in this sentence of Mr. Arnold, already quoted in another connection: —

> France has reaped from [the Revolution] one fruit, the natural and legitimate fruit . . . she is the country in Europe where the *people is* most alive.

There would seem to be no excuse for using the plural verb and pronoun, when the fact that the noun is singular in form is emphasized by giving it the indefinite article.

> To say that such *a people are* unassimilable is merely to confess that you will not permit *them* to be assimilated.

In Great Britain it seems to be the almost universal rule to treat all collective nouns having to do with political affairs as plural; as in the example from Lord Morley above. On the whole, one must admit that there is a certain advantage in an unalterable rule like that which obtains in French, that every noun singular in form takes a singular verb and is referred to by a singular pronoun, under any and all circumstances.

Good usage seems to sanction the use of either singular or plural verbs with these nouns of multi-

tude, subject only to the irrefragable rule that they must not be used with both singular and plural verbs in the same sentence, as they are used in this one: —

They say, however, rightly or wrongly, that the public *is* sick of war, that the public *wish* to forget the war.

This is the simplest form of violation of the rule. The "Atlantic" is strongly inclined to insist that, in all cases of this type, uncomplicated by the elements referred to in the next paragraph, the verb shall be in the singular, the noun being singular in form.

A less glaring, but equally objectionable, violation of the rule — or of what may be called a corollary of the rule — occurs when the noun itself is first used with a singular verb, and is thereafter referred to by a plural pronoun with a plural verb, as in the quotation from Professor Clay above, and in the following examples: —

Your *committee has* the honor to report that *they have* considered the matter referred to *them*, etc. (Either "have the honor," or "it has considered.")

The *Cabinet has* been devoting much of *its* time lately to certain aspects of the foreign relations of this government, and it is reported that *they are* fully agreed as to the policy to be pursued.

The *jury was* sent out about noon, and *are said* to have agreed at once, but to have postponed returning *their* verdict until *they* had had *their* dinner.

The *crowd was* quiet enough at first, but as the orator became more and more vehement, it was evident *they* too *were* rapidly warming up.

It is natural to follow a noun singular in form with a singular verb; but the tendency is strong, when the noun is to be replaced by a pronoun, to think of the individuals composing the association and change to the plural form.

4. The indeterminate pronouns *each*, *either*, *neither*, *every*, should always be used with a singular verb.

The neglect occurs chiefly when other words, including a plural noun, come between such pronoun and its verb.

And so *each* of his portraits *are* not only "a piece of history," but, etc. — STEVENSON.

On careful examination it is found that the material of which *each* of these layers . . . *are* composed, was for the most part, etc. — HUXLEY.

He asked the gardener whether *either* of the ladies *were* at home. — TROLLOPE.

Neither of these cities *were* inhabited by men of such independent spirit as the men of Ballyards. — ST. JOHN ERVINE.

Mr. Balfour . . . is not, after all, a typical Tory; and his *every taste* — his golf, his music, his Burne-Jones pictures, his philosophy, his blue-and-white China — *proclaim* him a very different being from the plain Tory of the stories. — E. T. RAYMOND.

Every is not now used (except in the most formal writing, when its use is based on its occasional occurrence alone in the Bible) unless with a noun, — when it may be regarded as an adjective, — and in the forms *everyone* and *everybody*.

Everybody present, except a few chronic malcontents, *were* [was] of opinion that the measure, or some similar one, must be passed at once.

Of all the examples under this paragraph it may be said that the use of the plural form of the verb can hardly be conceived except for the intervening clauses, with their plural nouns standing hard by the verbs.

Each is often used in apposition with a plural subject; in such cases the verb should be in the singular; although the effect may be clumsy and unpleasant, it can generally be avoided by placing *each* after the verb.

The Essays on Warren Hastings, Barère, and Croker's edition of Boswell, *each contain* some of the finest examples of Macaulay's peculiar powers as an essayist.

Good English demands "contains," *each* being the subject; but the difficulty can be got over by changing to "The Essays . . . contain, each, some of the finest examples," etc.

With the pairs of disjunctives, *either — or*, and *neither — nor*, a singular verb should be used if all the elements disjoined are in the singular.

You can take your choice: either the treasurership, or the secretaryship, or the chairmanship of the executive committee *are* [is] open to you; but I 'll be d——d if you can have all three.

Neither the Secretary of State, nor the Secretary of Commerce, nor the Attorney-General *are candidates* [is a candidate] for the position.

Of course, neither Socrates nor Plato, neither Zeno nor Epicurus *were modern philosophers* [was a modern philosopher].

When either of the elements is plural in form, the verb should be in the plural, even though the noun immediately preceding it is singular.

Neither whole nations, nor individual man, *retain* the right, etc.

5. The use of one of the prepositions or prepositional phrases, *with*, *after*, *in addition to*, *together with*, *as well as*, etc., which are practically equivalent to "and," frequently suggests a plural verb when the singular form is strictly required.

The President, *with* several members of the Cabinet, *were* [was] taken to the rendezvous on the Mayflower.

As wave *after* wave of children's classes *have* [has] broken against her, she has become quite strong.

Geography, *as well as* history and mathematics, *are* [is] among the subjects in which the school has been signally successful.

The novelty of his method, *combined with* his considerable literary skill, *render* [renders] his book both interesting and exciting.

In such cases as the first and third little seems to be gained by using the preposition instead of "and." The following example is fairly typical of a class in which the preposition forces one to choose between bad English and an absurdity.

Jones, *together with* his brother, *are* the only men in the county capable of such a feat.

"Jones" alone is the subject of the verb; but the singular verb is impossible. Such sentences should never be written.

One exception to this rule that a verb must always agree in number with its subject is to be noted: namely, in the case of certain measures, weights, or sums of money regarded as single wholes.

Fifty feet *is* the limit of height allowed for buildings on that property.

Ten pounds *is* the smallest amount one can buy.

Fifty dollars *is* a good deal of money to pay for perhaps twenty minutes' entertainment.

The following exceptional case, which involves neither verb nor pronoun, but in which the use of a plural noun seems to impart a collective quality to the word "standard," falls within no possible classification.

The public school should be succeeded by the University, the University by some profession in which a

perfectly different standard of person from that to which his father belonged made honourable *careers*. — E. F. BENSON. (Change to "persons of a perfectly different standard.")

II. Of Pronouns

This subject is closely connected, in one phase at least, with that of the number of verbs used with collective nouns; but it needs, perhaps, some further development.

(As the relative pronouns *who*, *which*, *what*, and *that*, have no plural forms, our remarks apply only to the use of *they*, *their*, *theirs*, *them*, instead of *it*, *its*.)

1. Collective nouns, if used in the first place with a verb in the singular, should not thereafter be referred to by plural pronouns.

For his family *was* dear to him, as he was to *them*.

And see the examples given under (3) in subheading I of this section.

2. *They*, *them*, *their*, *theirs* should never be used in referring back to singular antecedents.

Must *this* middle-class union be required to show by *their* [its] votes, by *their* [its] political action, that *they* [it] too *constitute* [constitutes] a class, that *they* [it] too *have* [has] interests, etc.

I should like to give the two sides, each so typical of the point of view *they* [it] represent[s].

Almost every member, young and old, showed by his manner or some little attention that *their* [his] sympathies were with the exile.

When the gender of a singular personal antecedent is double or indeterminate, good usage permits the use of *he*, *him*, *his*, to represent either gender or both.

Everybody is discontented with *their* [his] lot in life.

This was one of many cases arising out of the same transaction in which neither party desired to fulfil *their* [his] contract.

Imagine the emotions of a parent when told, not only that *their* [his or her] only son had fallen in France, but that his body had never been identified.

In a large majority of cases arising under this statute the plaintiff is unable to prove what is requisite to maintain *his* or *her* claim.

His or her, and *he or she*, are always unpleasant, but may be resorted to when *his*, alone, seems inadequate, or when legal precision of phraseology is necessary. It is well said that "it is a real deficiency in English that we have no pronoun like the French *soi*, *son*, to stand for *him or her*, *his or her*."[1]

Who meets him, or who meets her, in the street, sees that they are ripe to be each other's victim. — EMERSON.

This peculiar sentence is open to criticism in several respects. Grammatically, with the use of the disjunctive "or" and a singular verb, — "sees," — the pronoun referring to the two *who's*

[1] *The King's English*, p. 69.

should be singular, not plural; on the other hand, the plural "they" requires "victims," not victim. But how can a person who meets only "him" or only "her," see anything as to their relations to each other?

At this point, perhaps, better than at any other, it is fitting to say that, if Emerson, Ruskin, and many other masters of thought and word are criticized in these pages as if they were the undergraduate authors of themes in a course in English Composition, it is only because their writings are accessible and those of the undergraduate are not. It is not through the aberrations from the straightest paths of syntax that great writers have made themselves great, but through a much larger something with which these pages do not attempt to deal.

OMISSION OF WORDS

I. Verbs

A VERB may be omitted only when the form required by strict grammatical construction is the same as that previously used.

If he had been asked . . . what he thought of young women and society, he would probably *have stigmatized* them as he himself *had been* formerly: "not nice." — P. L. FORD.

The mood changes here from active to passive, and "stigmatized" should be repeated after "had been."

As the result of a sermon preached by Cotton the contest . . . *was* postponed, and the Newtown settlers [were] granted additional land.

A certain T—— G——, for an unspecified crime, *was* banished, his house pulled down, and all Englishmen [were] enjoined, etc.

The omission of *was* after house is permissible, but as "Englishmen" requires a different form, *were* must be supplied. The sentence would then read more smoothly if another "and" were inserted after "banished."

Had it not been for them, the Armada *might* indeed *have been* invincible, and the civilization of North

America [might have] been Latin instead of Anglo-Saxon.

As it was written, without the words in brackets, the sentence has a very harsh sound. It would have been better to omit the verb entirely than to retain "been" only.[1]

II. Nouns

1. When the same noun is the subject of more than one verb in the same sentence, it is omitted before all the verbs except the first, unless it is repeated for emphasis. The main statement needs no exemplification. A familiar example of the exception occurs in the address of Serjeant Buzfuz to the jury in Bardell *vs.* Pickwick.

Mr. Bardell was a man of his word, Mr. Bardell was no deceiver, Mr. Bardell was once a single gentleman himself, etc.

2. When the same noun is the *object* of more than one verb in the same sentence, it may be omitted after all of such verbs except the *last*. If it is used after the first, its place must be supplied by a pronoun after the others.

They held up and maltreated and robbed the travelers; *or*

They held up the travelers, and maltreated them and robbed them.

[1] See *The King's English*, p. 251, for a rule which would include all these examples, but which is rather too complicated to be included in this book.

III. Pronouns

The omission of relative pronouns has been referred to in the section devoted to such words. As to other pronouns, it may be said generally that the same rules apply to them as to nouns; with the additional remark that they are much more likely to be repeated for emphasis, as subjects, before, or as objects, after, a series of verbs. "*He* came, *he* saw, and *he* conquered," would be less exceptional than "Cæsar came, Cæsar saw, and Cæsar conquered." Of course, one must be certain that it is the same pronoun that is omitted before or after each verb.

He determined to discharge his conscience, requested an audience of the King, spoke earnestly of the dangers . . . and condemned the lawless cruelties that the soldiers had committed. — MACAULAY.

In any other connection, the omission of a pronoun is due to ignorance or carelessness, as in the following sentence, where the author evidently mistook his *that* for a relative pronoun; otherwise he would hardly have omitted "it."

Timothy gazed at her with an expression so stupid and uncomprehending that, had it truthfully indicated his mental capacity, [it] would have landed him in a public institution.

He might properly have written "with a stupid and uncomprehending expression that."

IV. The Conjunction "That"

The omission of *that* is said, by the authors of "The King's English," to be "quite legitimate, though often unpleasant."[1] The statement seems to be contradictory in its terms; for inasmuch as, logically, the conjunction must always be supplied, it can be only rhetorically that its omission is "legitimate"; and from that standpoint it can be legitimate only when it is not "unpleasant," or when the sentence runs more smoothly, or "sounds better," without it.

When *that* immediately precedes the sentence it governs, and is itself immediately preceded by some verb like "say," "think," and the like, it can often be omitted, not only without offense, but with advantage, in any except dignified and formal writing.

He said [*that*] he would go.

I thought [*that*] there must be something wrong.

She forgot [*that*] she was to ask her mother's advice before she took any further step.

Although he knew [*that*] he had done wrong, he gave no sign of contrition.

But, even in such less formal composition, the omission of *that* becomes unpleasant after almost any of the verbs that are synonymous with, or,

[1] Page 356.

perhaps, more emphatic than, "say" and "think." If we substitute "remarked," or "observed," or "answered," or "exclaimed," or "cried out," for "said," in the first example, or "reflected" for "thought" in the second, we can hardly do without the conjunction.

On the other hand, in the next examples, the presence of *that*, in the first two, adds, and, in the others, would add, to the dignity of the style.

The people, who thought *that* a new heaven and a new earth would automatically emerge after the bloody conflict.

We do not forget *that* an ideal can be used to chill us and make us despair.

I hardly imagine [that] there exists a profound scientific thinker, who has, etc.

My own opinion is [that] this addition to my tortures will do me no good — but I cannot hold out against my son.

I notice such mistakes as have been pointed out to me, but I am afraid [that] many more might be detected in a careful revision.

For, though Londoners understand [that] the Guildhall pigeons have as much right to the place as the Aldermen, etc.[1]

The place of *that* as a conjunction is sometimes filled by a comma, as in

[1] In the last five, the idea of "think" is variously expressed in the verbs or phrases preceding the conjunction.

The fact is, no such man . . . ever sat . . . in the editorial chair.

Be sure, the facts themselves are written in that color in a book which we shall all of us . . . have to read our page of, some day. — RUSKIN.

A learned physician tells us, the fact is invariable with the Neapolitan. — EMERSON.

You may be sure, the new-born man is not inert. — EMERSON.[1]

The next four examples are all taken from the same work of Ruskin,[2] in whose writings loose and careful constructions follow each other often in the same paragraph.

You may think, perhaps, [that] a Greek knight would have had a lower estimate of women than this Christian lover.

You cannot think *that* the buckling on of the knight's armor by his lady's hand was a mere caprice of romantic fashion.

That is to say, we think *that* a reverent and tender duty is due to one whose affection we still doubt.

. . . the moment we find [that] we can agree as to anything that should be done.

Even in the simple constructions we have thus far considered, the omission of *that* may be objectionable as tending to mislead.

I think he would discover [that] the scheme unfolded . . . is a perfectly intelligible one. (Here

[1] This construction was very frequently used by Emerson.
[2] *Sesame and Lilies.*

"scheme," without *that*, may be mistaken for the object of "discover.")

The omission of *that* is always objectionable, — and we should say, therefore, not legitimate, — when a parenthetical clause comes before the sentence which *that*, understood but not expressed, introduces.

The speaker maintained that it was indefensible [that,] merely because the material interests of their constituents were involved, Southern Congressmen should throw all their long-avowed principles to the winds. — *Congressional Record.*

Here, again, the omission of *that* tends to lead the reader on a false scent, as if the action of the Congressmen were condemned because their constituents' material interests were involved, rather than because their action was due to that fact.[1]

If *that* is omitted before the first of a series of similar clauses in the same construction, it should be omitted before all the others; on the other hand, if it is required with a subsequent clause, it should not be omitted in the first instance.

But there are some of you . . . who think life has no such close, *that* it is to float, etc. (As *that* is necessary before "it is" it should be supplied before "life.")

[1] See the quotations from the London *Times* given in *The King's English* on pp. 356, 357. "In some of these the motive is obvious, to avoid one *that* clause depending on another; the end was good, but the means bad; a more thorough recasting was called for."

V. Repetition of Conjunction "That"

In the class of cases referred to above, in which a clause is interpolated between *that* and the sentence it governs, the conjunction is frequently, but almost always improperly, repeated after the interpolated clause.

They said *that*, by laws curbing monopoly and introducing "the new freedom," and by bringing the government to that "simplicity and economy befitting a democratic government," *that* they would lift the burden, etc.

"The King's English," under the heading "Fresh Starts," says nothing more severe of this "trick of taking breath in the middle of a sentence by means of a 'resumptive that' or the like," than that it should be avoided, "especially when it is a confession rather of the writer's short-windedness than of the unwieldy length of his sentence."[1] There can hardly be degrees of culpability in this matter; and if the sentence is so long and unwieldy that the thread has to be picked up by a second *that*, it should be recast.

The objections to the repetition of *that* do not apply, however, when, as in the following extract from Matthew Arnold's "Function of Criticism," the thread is picked up with a modification of the original subject.

[1] Page 330.

Where shall we find language innocent enough, how shall we make the spotless purity of our intentions evident enough, to enable us to say to the political Englishman *that* the British constitution itself, which, seen from the practical side, looks such a magnificent organ of prowess and virtue, seen from the speculative side, — with its compromises, its love of facts, its horror of theory, its studied avoidance of clear thoughts, — *that*, seen from this side, our august constitution sometimes looks — forgive me, shade of Lord Somers! — a colossal machine for the manufacture of Philistines?

DIVERS MATTERS

Hanging Participle

THE nature of this phenomenon will sufficiently appear from the examples we give. The participial clauses are all "in the air," so to speak, when we should naturally expect to find the participle agreeing with the noun that follows. Such clauses are more likely to be found at the beginning of a sentence than elsewhere, and are less disconcerting there; but an ingeniously careless writer may plant one anywhere. The first example represents the most common form of this particular "ungrammaticism."

Talking with Senator —— the other day, he remarked upon the apparent utter lack of interest of senators in the most important debates.

While standing still, a hunting eagle swooped over the brow of the hill, etc.

Though entirely confident of the outcome, the situation is one that demands the utmost vigilance, etc.

While censured for his various acts of inhumanity . . . no action was taken against Moseley, by the authorities.

But *having taken the plunge*, the cutaneous glow and "euphoria" (*vide* dictionary) succeeded, etc.

Sitting on the verandah after dinner, *watching the sun* sink behind the hills, there came a sudden break in the silence, etc.

Prepared, on the other hand, *to take obscurity without resentment or envy*, because, *having sought first a certain Kingdom of Heaven*, all things were added.

The difficulty can in most cases be avoided by changing the participial clause to a clause with subject and predicate as in the revised versions given below; but the last example is a sort of Chinese puzzle.

[As I was] talking with Senator ——, the other day, he remarked, etc.

While [I was] standing still, an eagle, etc.

Though [we are] entirely confident . . . the situation, etc.

While [Moseley was] censured for his various acts of inhumanity, no action was taken against him.

But [when we had] taken the plunge, the cutaneous glow, etc.

[As we were] sitting, etc.

In "The King's English," such "unattached, or wrongly attached participles," as they are there called, are divided into eight classes, according to the "degree of heinousness" of the offense![1]

[1] Pages 110–116.

Nouns Used as Verbs

So far as possible we avoid in the "Atlantic" the use as verbs of certain words that are primarily nouns, when the meaning can be as well conveyed by other distinctly verbal forms; for example: —

Evidence, for prove, show, testify to, establish by evidence, witness, etc.
Glimpse, for espy, catch a glimpse of.
Loan, for lend.
Sense, for feel, perceive, etc.

The tendency to adopt this growing habit sometimes results in a manifest misuse of the word in question.

A concrete example of this truth has been *evidenced* here in our little town this past month.

The author, intending to say that "this truth" has been "evidenced" (testified to, established, supported) by an example, — that is, that an example of it has been *given*, — actually says something very different, namely, that the example itself has been established.

One may perhaps express a pious wish that some check might be imposed upon the journalistic use of the verb *stage*, and that it might be confined to its proper function in connection with the theatre. Every newspaper reader must have noticed the frequency with which the word is now

used to describe every sort of occurrence, from a street row to a wedding.

The Split Infinitive

Despite the arguments of those who claim that "to" is no part of the infinitive, and that there is, therefore, no reason why other words should not be placed between "to" and the verb-form that accompanies it, the curious superstition referred to by the Messrs. Fowler[1] still abides in the Atlantic office, and the "split infinitive" is taboo there, if for no other reason, because it is "an ugly thing," and because, while there may be degrees in its ugliness, it never becomes lovely.[2] Although those authors seem to imply that journalists are inclined to conscientiously avoid (as the splitters would say) this particular mode of expression, experience leads rather to the opinion that they run a close second to many of the gentlemen whose speeches are reported in the "Congressional Record," from which is taken the first of the examples following.

Can we afford *to thus offend* our second-best world-customer?[3] Can we afford *to so legislate* that she [Canada] can justly accuse us of discriminating against her products and her trade?

[1] *The King's English*, p. 319: ". . . The curious superstition that the splitting or not splitting makes the difference between a good and a bad writer."

[2] "I do not object to split infinitives," says a recent contributor to the *Atlantic*, "I split so many of them myself."

[3] "World-customer" has been born, we think, since the war.

The next are typical specimens of the ugliness of this turn of expression.

She prayed and strove that she might give him of her best, *to practically help* him.

And the next time you raise your gun *to needlessly take* a feathered life.

It very seldom happens that any more considerable change is required than to place the intervening word or words before "to" or after the verb.

Subjunctive Forms

In the matter of subjunctive, or conditional, forms, the "Atlantic" confines itself to the endeavor to make sure that they are used correctly, if an author desires to use them. It does not suggest them or undertake to supply them, even when they would be strictly correct, except in the single case of *were*, generally to indicate a condition contrary to fact.

If it *were* pleasant [meaning that it is not pleasant], I should go.

If I were you [but I am not], I should go no further with it.

It may be that it is correct to say: "If he *be* the man you say he is, he won't do it," to express one's doubt that "he" is such a man; but there is no question that the "prim and pomp-

ous be" is rapidly passing out of use, together with all similar forms.

The Indefinite Article, before "h" and "u"

Before words beginning with *h*, use *a* with monosyllables and words accented on the first syllable: *a hat, a habit, a hurricane.* In such cases one bears heavily on the aspirate, so that it is equivalent to a consonant. Before polysyllables accented elsewhere than on the first syllable, use *an: an habitual* criminal, *an historical* novel, *an heretical* opinion. In such words the *h* is naturally so slurred in pronunciation that its presence is scarcely apparent, and a distinct effort is required to pronounce it distinctly, as one must if *a* is used before it. With those words beginning with *hu* in which the combination is pronounced almost like *yu*, *a* should always be used, without regard to the accent: *a humane* disposition, *a humility* almost like fawning.

Before words beginning with *u* having the sound of *yu*, it is better not to use *an*, as is sometimes done — for no conceivable reason except to impart an air of false "elegance." Why should one write "*an usual* occurrence," any more than "*an young* man," or "*an year*"?

Adjectives and Adverbs ending in "ly"

1. Adjectives ending in *ly* — *leisurely, likely* — are improperly used as adverbs. As the adverbial

forms — *leisurelily, likelily* — are quite impossible,[1] some other word should be substituted, or, if necessary, the idea should be expressed by a phrase.

"Probably" differs so slightly, if at all, in meaning from "likely," that it is difficult to conceive a case in which it might not be substituted for it. As in —

The biologist finds another evidence of man's place in nature . . . in the conditions of the physical variation among different human races — or species, as they would *likely* be called by any entirely disinterested student of human kind. — VERNON KELLOGG.

"He strolled along *leisurely*" is, in no point of view, more effective than "He strolled along at a leisurely gait," or "without haste."

2. An adverb ending in *ly* should not modify an adjective — *a fortiori*, not an adverb — with the same termination. The objection is, of course, purely rhetorical.

Indeed, we can imagine the first human beings picking up *naturally partly* flaked flints, etc. [The meaning is, flints partly flaked by the action of nature.]

But man's social inheritance is so incomparably greater and more important in determining the character of his life, that he is, in this respect, *practically qualitatively* different from all other animals.

[1] This sentence was in type before the writer fell in with the expression, in an *Atlantic* MS., "their teeth grinned *ghastlily*"!

Special Words and Phrases

Any

An exceedingly common, but none the less erroneous, use of *any* is typified in this sentence from Lord Morley's "Recollections": —

The constituency was the largest, I think, of *any* borough in the kingdom at that time.

This might have been made to read quite as smoothly, and more grammatically: —

The constituency was the largest of all the boroughs, etc., *or*

The constituency was larger than any other borough, etc.

Disraeli said that he had the largest parliamentary knowledge of *any* [a larger . . . than any other] man he had met.

They make the best impression of *any* [a better impression than any other] audience of that sort that I have seen except the Brooklyn one.

As and Than

As and *than* are properly conjunctions, not prepositions. If this is borne in mind, it will generally be a simple matter to determine the proper case of the following noun.

I love you better than him.

Than being a conjunction, this can have no other meaning than "I love you better than [I

love] him." If *than* were a preposition, the sentence might mean either that, or "I love you better than he loves you."

I can't understand why it is n't just as necessary that you should speak to him as her.

The author of this sentence meant that it was just as necessary that the person addressed should speak to "him" as that the one spoken of as "her" should; but, by treating *as* as a preposition, he made himself say: "I can't understand why it is n't just as necessary that you should speak to him as it is that you should speak to her."

"It must further be noticed that both *as* and *than* are conjunctions of the sort that can either, like *and*, etc., merely join coördinates, or like *when*, etc., attach a subordinate clause to what it depends on. This double power sometimes affects the case."[1]

As to the illustrative example, from Professor Huxley, — "It is to him and such men as *he* that we owe the change," — these authors say: "This example is defensible, *as* being here a subordinating conjunction, and *as he* being equivalent to *as he is*. But it is distinctly felt to need defence, which *as him* would not; *as* would be a coördinating conjunction, and simply join the pronoun *him* to the noun 'men.'"

[1] *The King's English*, p. 63.

As is sometimes used as a sort of pseudo-relative pronoun. The most familiar example is in the formula frequently employed by presiding officers in putting a question! "*As many as* are in favor will say aye." Although the formula may be sanctified by usage, certainly it is not correct English. More careful officers will generally say: "All those who are in favor," etc. And curiously enough, when the negative is called for, it is almost always done in this form: "All those opposed will say nay."

As Though for As If

This common error is quite without justification unless it can be justified by its very frequent use, even by writers who certainly know better. There is always an ellipsis when the phrase is used, and if we supply the necessary words to complete the thought, the solecism is manifest at once.

It seemed to him . . . *as though*, through all that eternity of waiting, he knew what the answer would be.

Written in full, this would be: —

It seemed to him . . . as it would have seemed, *though*, etc.

which, of course, does not make sense.

Captain Hastings thought he looked *as though* he would be less perturbed, but did not say so.

The necessary change to express the whole thought: —

Captain Hastings thought that he [the other man] looked as he would look *if* he were the sort of man who would be less perturbed under similar circumstances.

The writer has been unable to find any instance in which the amplification of the thought does not make the use of *though*, instead of *if*, impossible.

With respect to *as if*, the authors of "The King's English," (pages 156, 157) call attention to the danger of following with the wrong tense, if the fact that there is an ellipsis is forgotten. One should always use the tense that would be required if the ellipsis were supplied.

We will not appear like fools in this matter, *as if* we *have* no authority over our own daughter.

Meaning: "as we should appear if we *had* no authority," etc.

As if the fruit or the flower not only *depends* on a root, . . . but *is* itself actually the root.

Meaning: "As would be the case if the flower not only *depended* on the root . . . but *was* itself actually the root."

It hardly looks *as if* the negro *gets* the worst of it.

Meaning: It hardly looks as it would look if the negro *got* the worst of it.

Beside — Besides

These words are often used almost interchangeably, although the distinction in meaning is clear

enough. *Beside* means "by the side of"; *besides*, "in addition to." The proper form is chosen in each of these examples.

Beside the arguments that you bring forward I set this one, which is stronger than all the rest.

Besides these arguments, he might well have put forward this other, more convincing one.

He sat *beside* me.

There were just ten men in the hall, and perhaps twenty-five women *besides* myself.

Both are prepositions, although *besides* is sometimes used alone, as if adverbially, in the sense of "moreover." In such cases, however, "that," or "this," or some other word, or, perhaps, a phrase, is understood.

A man of so little force could never have gone ahead so far without "a pull"; besides, he is generally reputed to be far from scrupulous.

Different From or Different To

There is authority for the use of both *from* and *to* with *different, differently, difference.* It is largely a question of taste (although *to* is found much more frequently in the works of British writers), and the taste of the "Atlantic" is for *from* rather than *to. Different than*, which one sometimes finds, cannot justify itself on the ground of good usage.[1]

[1] See *The King's English*, pp. 161 *ff.*, for a discussion of the proper use of these and other prepositions.

Directly for As Soon As

This distinctively British use of *directly* as a conjunction, which is occasionally encountered in "Atlantic" MSS., is explained in the New English Dictionary as "Elliptical for *directly that, as*, or *when*." It is there characterized as colloquial, although the modern examples of it are taken from the works of Cardinal Newman and from Buckle's "History of Civilization."

But it admits of criticism, and will become suspected *directly* it is accused.

The celebrated work of De Lolme on the English constitution was suppressed . . . *directly* it appeared.

Do

(*As a substitute for another verb, to avoid awkward repetition*)

It cannot properly be used as a substitute for *be*. Instances of this error are rare, and are so manifest as hardly to need pointing out.

It . . . ought to have been satisfying to the young man. And so, in a manner of speaking, it *did* [was].

The author acted on the theory that he had written: "It ought to have satisfied the young man"; when *did* [did satisfy] would have been right.

In respect to other verbs than *be*, the substitution of some form of *do*, to avoid repetition, may properly be made only when the construction is not changed, as from the active to the passive

voice, or *vice versa*, or from a compound to a simple verb.

But has the man whose working hours are so full of responsibilities changed as much as he seems to have *done?*[1]

I chose my wife, as she *did* her wedding gown.

In these two the substitution is proper, but not in those that follow.

The inference cannot properly be drawn, as Mr. Smith *does* [as Mr. Smith draws it].

It is very questionable whether it is wise for this country to enter upon an undertaking which they are [2] likely to have every reason to regret *doing* [entering upon].

Doubt

If, upon hearing a statement, one says, *tout court*, "I doubt it," disbelief, rather than uncertainty, is implied. But there is a rather sharp distinction between "I doubt *that* it is so," and "I

[1] It may seem that this matter of the use of *do* is no more within the limited scope of this work than a good many others of equal or greater importance, to which no reference is made. But it happens that the question was imported into the subject of Atlantic usage in connection with the sentence to which this note is affixed. It is taken from a paper by Dr. S. M. Crothers; and his use of *done* was criticized by a correspondent, who "wanted to know" whether the sentence should be "completed" by the addition of "changed," so that it would read "as much as he seems to have done changed." The curious reader can find the correspondent's letter and the reply of the editor of the *Atlantic* in the Contributors' Column of the issue of December, 1917 (unbound copies).

[2] Query: *it is?* See under "Number," p. 244.

doubt *whether* it is so, or not." The first, again, is rather likely to mean "I believe that it is not so"; the other, to indicate real uncertainty.

The authors of "The King's English" seem to the writer to treat this subject less adequately than they treat most of those that they discuss. They say: "If there is nothing to show that the writer considers the doubt an unreasonable one, the word is always 'whether,' which reminds us that there is a suppressed alternative: —

"'I doubt whether this is true (or not).'

"If it is evident that the writer disapproves of the doubt, the words introducing it amount to an affirmation on his part that the thing doubted is undoubtedly true; the alternative is no longer offered; 'that' is therefore the word: —

"'I do not doubt (*i.e.*, I am sure that).'
"'Who can doubt that . . . ?'"[1]

This is all right as far as it goes, but it suggests that *that* is never the right word to use except when the doubt is introduced by words amounting to an affirmation that the thing doubted is undoubtedly true. On the contrary, there are many cases where *that* is properly used, without such introductory words, to indicate almost the exact opposite. The following passage, cited by them as an example of the improper substitution of *that* for *whether*, well illustrates the point: —

[1] Pages 159, 160.

I am afraid that you will become so afraid of men's motives as to doubt *that* any man can be honest. — TROLLOPE.

That is to say, to believe that no man can be honest.

I do not think it would have pleased Mr. Thackeray; and to doubt that he would have wished to see it carried out determines my view of the matter.

Here, the first clause, "I do not think," makes it certain that "to doubt that he would have wished" means "to believe that he would not have wished."

The not uncommon phrase, "I do not doubt but what," is a pure vulgarism for "I do not doubt *that*."

DUE TO

Often improperly used instead of "because of," or "on account of," or some similar phrase.

. . . because, although, as we have seen, there is plenty of cotton in European ports, Czecho-Slovakia, *due to* [on account of] the depreciation of her currency, has no way of paying for it.

Due to [because of] the new walks and changes in the Common, Hughy McGrath, who has charge of the games, etc. — *Newspaper*.

Our currency was increased, our gold supply doubled, *due to* the needs of the Allies, who were obliged to exchange their gold for our supplies. — *Congressional Record*.

The only possible grammatical construction of these sentences makes "due" (an adjective) agree

with "Czecho-Slovakia," "Hughy McGrath," and "currency," which is clearly impossible.

True, there are many Arabs living there, more, for example, than Greeks, Germans, or Latins, *due to* the proximity of Arabia.

The phrase is more defensible in this last example, because it is the whole of what goes before it that is due to the proximity of Arabia; but if it is to be retained, it is much better to make the sentence read: ". . . than Greeks . . . this condition being due to," etc.

A curious misuse of *due* is found in the following communication to the editor of the "Atlantic." The meaning seems to be that "this usually conservative magazine" *ought* to make an investigation, and the rest. It will be observed that the writer was not particular about placing his correlatives, "not only . . . but."

It is *due* for this usually conservative magazine to investigate the facts and make an abject apology to not only the citizens of this peaceful little city, but to, etc.

Farther — Further

These forms are used almost interchangeably, both as adjectives and as adverbs, by many writers. It is believed to be the better practice to use the first in referring to actual physical conditions; the other in figurative language.

The path led on and on into the *farther* recesses of the forest.

He strayed *farther* than he intended.

As he continued his address, he found himself involved in *further* intricacies.

The general not only hinted at his plan of operations, but went *further* and told just what units he expected to use at each stage.

Speaking generally, English writers are more inclined to use *further* almost exclusively, and that practice was followed by the late Henry James. But an eminent American novelist, who made use of the phrase "farther opportunities," replied somewhat testily to the proof-reader who suggested the substitution of "further," "Further is a verb; farther is the comparative of far." This implied that the intention was to use the comparative of "*far* opportunities" — a manifest absurdity. The fact is, of course, that, in such cases, *farther*, or *further*, means simply *more*, or *additional*, when used as an adjective, the adjective *far* being seldom if ever used except in reference to actual physical distance. As an adverb, *far* is frequently used in a figurative sense, and the choice of *further* as its comparative in that sense is made in order to carry out as far as possible the purpose to give to each word a distinctive meaning. There is no lack of authority for either word, although the

New English Dictionary inclines toward the distinction that we make.

Lay and Lie

The frequent misuse of these words for one another had been purposely omitted from consideration here, as one of the numerous cases of bad English, pure and simple, with which the "Atlantic" has not previously had to reckon. But the following sentence in a very recent issue of the magazine, having passed all hands without detection, has been good-naturedly, if somewhat satirically, called to our attention by more than one watchful correspondent.

> Whatever she wore refused to fit, seeming to *lay* snugly on her round back, etc.

The confusion is due, of course, to the fact that *lie* becomes *lay* in the past tense. But as we are estopped by this offense from saying that everybody should be familiar with the distinction, we observe that *lie*, which is always intransitive, and *lay*, which is always transitive, are conjugated respectively, thus: —

Present Indicative	*Past Indicative*	*Past Participle*
I lie down	I lay down	I have lain down
I lay it down	I laid it down	I have laid it down

Like for As

It was in me just *like* [as] life was in me; that life of which a popular saying affirms that "life is sweet."

Agriculture and cotton . . . are not organized, and have no reserve capital, *like* [as] our corporate interests in this country have.

This is always a vulgarism, and is admissible only in conversation, when the interlocutors are represented as speaking as they are likely to speak, not as they should speak. It is, unhappily, found on many a page of the "Congressional Record." This excerpt from a very recent issue of that reservoir of eloquence furnishes also a flagrant example of the misplacement of *not only*.[1]

Some one sent me some photographs of these mass meetings which were being held in Japan, and it looked to me *not only like* thousands but hundreds of thousands of people were in attendance upon them.

Meanwhile — Meantime

These words standing by themselves, generally at the beginning of a sentence, are used almost interchangeably — often by the same writer, in exactly the same sense, on successive pages. It is customary in the "Atlantic" to give the preference to *meanwhile*, reserving the other for the phrase "*in the meantime*."

[1] See under "Correlatives," pp. 236 *ff*.

O — Oh

O is properly used, except in poetry, only with the vocative case, especially in appeals and invocations. It should always be capitalized, and should not be followed by a comma.

Oh is used only as an exclamation; it should be capitalized only at the beginning of a sentence, and, in the absence of an exclamation mark, should *always* be followed by a comma.[1]

Off = From

This error, or vulgarism, occurs oftenest in connection with "borrow," or some similar verb. It is common enough in colloquial conversation, when it frequently takes the more objectionable form, *off of*, — "Can I get a piece of tobacco off of you?" — but it is offensive in narration.

But he [Mr. Chesterton] would not walk round St. James's Square. He would, in Johnson's circumstances, ride round and round in a cab — even if he had to borrow the fare *off* the cabman.

On and Upon

It is difficult to formulate a rule for the use of one or the other of these words. It may, perhaps, be said that the shorter form is preferable, generally speaking, in connection with actual physical position or motion or direction, especially when

[1] For the position of the exclamation mark, see p. 146 *supra*.

such motion or direction is downward. We not infrequently meet with such expressions as "He threw it down *upon* the ground," or "He lay down *upon* the floor," in which the only conceivable motive for the use of *upon* is that it is more "elegant" than *on*. Again, where the motion or direction indicated is upward, if it is necessary to describe it in terms, it is generally better to employ "up" as an adverb in connection with the preposition "on." "He climbed *up on* (or to) the platform," rather than, "He climbed *upon* the platform."[1]

In other than physical connotations the use of *upon* is too firmly established to be shaken, even if it were objectionable. But in the writer's opinion, it is an eminently proper and desirable distinction to make in the use of the word, as it is always advisable, if possible, to give to every word a distinctive meaning. It is possible to specify only a very few of the cases in this category in which *upon* is used.[2]

That depends *upon* circumstances.

In his argument he dwelt insistently *upon* the paramount importance of the adhesion of America to the League.

Upon these facts and figures I base my assertion that, etc.

[1] The verbs "mount" and "ascend" are properly used transitively, and not, as frequently occurs, with either *on* or *upon*. "He mounted the rostrum," not "He mounted *upon* the rostrum."

[2] It is not intended to imply that *on* might not properly be used in most, if not all, of these instances.

In this non-physical sense, *upon* may properly be used in connection with "down," as the idea of upward direction in *upon* is lost sight of.

It is wrong to use both *on* and *upon* in different branches of the same sentence, in precisely the same connection, as in the two following quotations: —

An awkward, shy, loose-jointed frontiersman, whose shabby and ill-fitting uniform hung *upon* him as *on* a clothes-horse.

That class of events properly called miraculous, whose existence depends, not only *on* their absurdity, but *upon* their impossibility.

The compound preposition *onto* (although analogous to *into*) is generally regarded as a colloquialism, and should be printed as two words.

One (Impersonal)

The possessive of *one* is "one's," not "his," or "their"; and *one* should be repeated, rather than be replaced by "you" or any pronoun. "Those who doubt their ability to handle it skillfully under these restrictions should only use it where no repetition or substitute is needed." [1]

That inequality and incongruousness in his writing which makes *one* revise *his* [one's] judgment at every page.

He is a man who speaks with Bismarckian frankness, and who directly impresses *one* with the impression

[1] *The King's English*, p. 328. The examples given in that work seem to show that Lowell was a confirmed offender in this regard.

that *you are* [one is] speaking to a man and not to an incarnate bluebook.

But he never allowed *one* to feel *their* [one's] own deficiencies, for he never appeared to be aware of them himself.

Only

Only is very frequently misplaced, even in the work, otherwise unexceptionable, of the most esteemed writers, whom it seems over-bold to criticize. But the rule that *only* should stand next to the word or phrase to which it applies is too clear, it would seem, to need exemplification. In all the examples the rule is violated.

The peasants *only* deliver raw materials under compulsion.

The meaning is, of course, that they do not deliver raw materials unless they are compelled to, not that the only thing they do under compulsion is deliver raw materials; so that *only* should be placed before "under."

All the books and reading in the world are *only* valuable [valuable only] as they are helps. — Arnold.

There can be no compromise between this attitude and that of Henry James, for whom art was strictly an affair of giving form and significance to life; with ultimate results, no doubt, which go beyond the æsthetic, but which are *only* to be attained [attained only] through this medium by not being directly sought.

That is to say, the only way to attain these results through this medium is by not seeking them directly; therefore *only* should stand after "medium" and before "by."

For, instead of being properly mixed, they [the Americans] are divided into ethnographic strata, which *only* touch at the edges.

As it stands, this would mean, grammatically, that these strata touch at the edges, but do not run into each other, or coalesce, there; but, as the meaning is, presumably, that they touch at the edges and nowhere else, *only* should stand immediately before "at the edges."

For there are some familiar axioms which the individual *only* seems to be able to learn the meaning of through his individual experience.

This does not mean that the individual only seems, but really is not able, etc., but that he seems not to be able to learn the meaning of these axioms unless he has individual experience of their truth; therefore *only* should stand between "of" and "through."

The same remarks apply to "alone," "simply," "merely," "solely," and perhaps other words, used in the sense of "only."

The pernicious sway of Capitalism is *solely* due [due solely] to the fact that humanity is divided up into nations.

The abundant exemplification of this point is due to two facts: that the error is a *very* common one, and that authors not infrequently, in reading their proofs and observing that the position of *only* has been changed, indicate a desire to have it restored to its original position.

Shall and Will
Should and Would

The intricacy and difficulty of the various questions concerning the proper employment of these words may be gauged by the fact that "The King's English" devotes no less than twenty-four pages to a comprehensive discussion of the subject. But the discussion is not comprehensive only — it is exceedingly obscure and involved; and in the present attempt to throw some light into the darkness, little assistance has been derived from it.

The following historical remarks, however, are interesting: "In Old English there was no separate future; present and future were one. *Shall* and *will* were the presents of two verbs, to which belong also the past *should* and *would*, the conditionals *should* and *would*, and the past conditionals *should have* and *would have*. *Shall* had the meaning of command or obligation, and *will* of wish. But as commands and wishes are concerned mainly with the future, it was natural that a

future auxiliary tense should be evolved out of these two verbs."[1]

1. To denote "simple futurity," — an unsatisfactory phrase, but one commonly employed, for which no comprehensive substitute suggests itself, — *shall* and *should* are used in the first person, *will* and *would* in the second and third persons.

I (we) *shall* go.
You *will* go.
He (they) *will* go.
I (we) *should* go, if . . .
You *would* go, if . . .
He (they) *would* go, if . . .

The conditional forms usually carry a suggestion that the condition is (or will be) unfulfilled.

2. To denote a wish, purpose, command, promise, threat, or the like, *will* and *would* are used in the first person, *shall* and *should* in the second and third.

I *will* go (it is my determination or intention to go).

You *shall* go (I am willing that you should go, I promise you that you may go, I order you to go).

He *shall* go (with similar meanings).

I *would* go (I should be willing, or should desire, to go), if . . .

You *should* go (I should be willing that you should go, I should insist upon your going), if . . .

They *should* not go (I *should* forbid them to go, I should prevent their going), if . . .

[1] *The King's English*, p. 134.

Exceptions to the use of *shall*, in the second and third persons, to express a definite command from one who is entitled to command, are found in the more emphatic forms: —

You *will* go to your room at once.

Mr. Jones *will* report to his commanding officer tomorrow morning.[1]

3. In asking questions with the first person for subject, *shall* should *always* be used, whatever the implication of the question.

Shall I have another chance? (Mere futurity.)

Shall I go, or shall I not? (Uncertainty, or a request for advice.)

Shall I be here at this time next year? (Uncertainty.)

What train *shall* I take? (Asking for instructions.)

In asking questions with the subject in the second or third person, the rule is often stated to be that one should use *shall* or *will* according to the answer "expected." It would be more accurate to say, according to the form of the answer sought. For example, if we wish to know whether the person we are addressing intends to go somewhere or do something, we say: "*Shall* you go?" or "*Shall* you do this or that?" That is to say, we request him to answer, "I *shall*," or "I *shall* not." On the other hand, if we wish to know whether he

[1] See *The King's English*, pp. 138, 139.

is willing, we say, "*Will* you go?" or "*Will* you do this or that?" requesting him to answer, "I *will*" or, "I *will* not."

In asking questions with *should* or *would*, the rule that the choice should depend upon the answer sought applies with all three persons, subject to the reservation that one is hardly likely to ask, except possibly in soliloquy, what one would be willing or likely to do under certain circumstances. For instance, one might well say: "*Should* I go if my father gets better?" — that is, "Ought I to go?" or "Do you advise me to go?" But one would hardly ask a third person: "Would I go, etc.?" — that is, "Should I be willing (or likely) to go?"

4. In indirect discourse, the choice between *shall* and *will*, *should* and *would*, can almost always be determined by turning the sentence into direct discourse.

He told me that he *should* (*would*) wait another week.

Did he say: "I *shall* wait," that is, "I propose to wait," or "I *will* wait," that is, "I am willing to wait?"

If the first, *should* is the proper form; if the second, *would*.

5. *Should* alone, of the four forms we are considering, is used in the sense of "ought" — or, more accurately, "ought to." This ultra-familiar

use of the word hardly calls for exemplification.

6. *Would* is improperly used with "be willing" or "like." One ought always to say: "I *should* be willing," "I should like."

"There has lately been an influenza of *would* in the wrong place, afflicting this land," wrote the late Professor F. J. Child. "People are saying to an alarming extent: I *would* like, *would* you like, instead of I *should* like, *should* you like."

Would itself connotes wish or volition; so that "I would like," means "I should like to like," etc.

6. Two idiomatic uses of *would* are —

(*a*) To denote a custom or habit.

He *would* sit and brood over his grievance for hours at a time.

Well I wot
With her needles would she sit,
And for hours she would knit —
Would she not?

(*b*) To express a fervent wish.

Would that I were young again!
Would God that it might be so!

This whole problem is vastly simplified by the answer given by one of the students in a preparatory school, "who will be in college next year," to the question: "Explain the use of *shall* and *will*." — "Shall is used by polite people, *will* by all others"!

Transpire

This word is frequently used (especially in journalese) but always incorrectly, in the sense of "to happen." Aside from its meaning as a medical term (synonymous with *per*spire), it has no other legitimate sense than "to become known" ("come out"). "As a synonym for *become known*," say Messrs. Fowler, "transpire is journalistic and ugly, but may pass; as a synonym for *happen*, it is a bad blunder, but not uncommon. . . . Even in the legitimate sense, originally a happy metaphor for leaking out, but now vulgarized and 'dead.'"[1]

"The only quarrel I have with you," — so J. R. Lowell wrote to Aldrich, apropos of "The Story of a Bad Boy," — "is that I found in it that infamous word 'transpired.' E pluribus unum it! . . . You are on the very brink of the pit."

That repository of "elegant" but incorrect English, the "Congressional Record," reports a legislator as saying, in a speech on a resolution relating to the expenses of the inauguration of President Harding: —

> It is a national event of quadrennial occurrence, and the people come. They will be here, without regard to what action Congress takes . . . and the only thing that is contemplated, so far as I know, is to ask sufficient funds of Congress to provide for the safety and comfort of the people who will be here when that event *transpires*.

[1] *The King's English*, pp. 16, 24 note.

Try and for Try to

This mistake is so common in unstudied everyday conversation that an author cannot be criticized for using it in reporting conversations. It is mentioned here only because it is sometimes found in other forms of composition, and has, not infrequently, to be "edited out" of copy. In the examples that follow, the words necessary to complete the grammatical construction are inserted in brackets, to show the nature of the solecism. It is worth noting that "and" instead of "to" is not used with synonyms of *try*, as "attempt" or "endeavor."

I propose to try and [I propose to] describe the events of that day.

Mr. Long seems inclined to try and [seems inclined to] throw doubt over the persecution at Lyons, etc.

While

While originally had only a *time* meaning, as in

Nero fiddled while Rome was burning.

Thence it came, by extension, to be used to denote a contrast; in this sense almost equivalent to *whereas*.

The Republican Senators voted straight to a man, *while* several Democrats disregarded the party whip and voted with them.

The loose and inaccurate use of the word — "the vicious *while*" — as a more or less elegant

alternative for *and* or *although* should be avoided. This use is especially frequent in newspaper English, but, unhappily, it is found in more dignified composition.

If Great Britain and America agreed . . . they should also agree that . . . they would make common cause to enforce it, *while* [and] in any general conference . . . they would command a majority, etc.

The town meeting, therefore, was a completely democratic institution in only one of its aspects, *while* [although] it came to have great influence upon both political theory and practice.

CONCLUSION

"Des communications et des rencontres, voilà ce qui arrive à tout lexicographe en quête de matériaux." This remark, with which Littré begins the preface to the second supplement to his great dictionary, has more than once struck a responsive chord in the present writer's heart when he has been engaged upon some task which consisted to a certain extent in waiting for *communications et rencontres* from sources to which he had no clue.

So, as this book has been making its slow progress through the press, he has found himself constantly happening upon what seemed to him better examples than those he had chosen of some of the points he has touched upon. Furthermore, he has often been beset by doubts as to whether he should not have included some matters that he has omitted. He has yielded in some degree to the temptation to substitute, or add, new examples; but he has not felt justified in increasing the size of the book by going outside of his original plan — to include only such matters as have been brought to his attention in the course of his work on the "Atlantic" and Atlantic books.

INDEX

A, an. *See* Indefinite Article.
ABBREVIATIONS, period after, 66, 67; in text, 163; in footnotes, 167.
Afterward, 195.
Aldrich, T. B., 294.
Amid, Amidst, 195, 196.
Among, Amongst, 195, 196.
Ampersand, 165.
And, the only proper correlative of *both*, 237; prepositions equivalent to, 250, 251.
And which construction, 213–16.
Any, misuse of, 271.
Anyone, 206 and *n.*
APOSTROPHE, with possessives ending in *s*, 161; in contractions, 161 and *n.*
Arnold, Matthew, *Functions of Criticism*, 137, 262.
Article, Indefinite. *See* Indefinite Article.
As, properly a conjunction, 271, 272; as pseudo-relative, 273. And *see Like.*
As if, 273, 274.
As many as, 273.
As though, used for *as if*, 273, 274.
Atlantic Monthly, handling of proofs of, 37–40; authors' corrections in, 38 *n.*
Atlantic Monthly Press, 1.
Atlantic usage, generally, 38 *n.*
Authors, and copy, 15–20, 61, 62; and proofs, 62, 63.

Backward, 195.
Be (subjunctive), 268.
Besant, Sir Walter, 36.
Besides, 274, 275.
Booth, W. S., *A Practical Guide for Authors*, quoted or referred to, 43, 180, 181 and *n.*, 192.
Both . . . and. *See* Correlatives.
BRACKETS, uses of, 145.
Browning, Robert, quoted, on proof-readers, 36.

Calverley, C. S., "Forever," 206.
Canfield, Dorothy, *The Brimming Cup*, 69.
CAPITALIZATION, lack of uniformity in, 168; consistency the chief end, 168; Atlantic rules for, 170–177; and the war, 178.
Carbon copies, 18.
Carlyle, Thomas, 84.
Century Dictionary, 36, 70, 117 *n.*, 189.
Clay, A. T., 247.
Cobbett, William, career of, 8, 9; his *English Grammar*, quoted or referred to, 8, 9–13, 52, 73, 79 *n.*, 139, 163, 166, 167, 211, 212, 213 and *n.*, 214 *n.*, 227, 242 *n.*, 244 *n.*
Collective nouns, proper use of relatives with, 208; number of verb with, 244–48, 252; an elastic category, 244, 245.
COLON, formal uses of, 71, 72; chief use of, in *Atlantic*, 72 *ff.*
COMMA, and semicolon, difficulty of drawing definite lines in use of, 89 and *n.*, 90,

91; modern tendency to economy in use of, 89, 90; Atlantic rules for use of, 91 *ff.*; before "and" with last of a series, 92, 93; before "not only," etc., 97; when subject changes, 98; with parenthetical clauses, 99, 100, 110–13; after certain words and phrases, 100–102; with participial clauses, 102; after clauses placed out of natural order, 102–104; between subject and predicate, 104 *ff.*; between verb and object, 109, 110; with defining and non-defining clauses, 113–17; to indicate omission of words, 117, 118; with coördinate words or phrases, 118–21; never used with single dash, 121; when used with dashes in pairs, 121, 122, and with parentheses, 122, 123; formal uses of, 123, 124.

COMMON PARTS, rule relating to, 230; examples of divers types of violation of rule, 230–36.

Compositors, vagaries of, 27, 28.

COMPOUND WORDS, use or non-use of hyphen in, Sir J. Murray on, 197, 198; Hart's rules concerning, 198 and *n.*, 199, 204; Summey on, 201; different categories of, 202 *ff.* And *see* Nouns, compound.

Congressional Record, 145, 167, 211, 267, 294.

Conjunctions, coördinating and subordinating, 90, 91. And *see That* (conjunction).

Coördination, and the *and which* construction, 216.

Copy, preparation of, 15–20; punctuation of, 61, 62; directions to "follow," 62.

Copy-holder, duties of, 26 and *n.*, 27.

Correctors of the press. *See* Proof-readers.

Correlatives, proper position of, 236–41.

Cowper, William, 31, 32.

Crothers, S. M., 277 *n.*

Curves. *See* Parentheses.

DASH, single, with semicolon, 87, 88; sometimes preferable to comma, 111; comma not used with, 121, 131; formal uses of, 127, 128; other uses of, 128 *ff.*; with other points, 132.

DASHES in pairs, comma when used with, 121, 122, 135; to set off parenthetical clauses, 133 *ff.*, 142, 144, And *see* En-Dash, Two-Em Dash.

De Morgan, W., 127, 188 *n.*

De Vinne, T. L., quoted, 25, 26 *n.*; on proof-readers, 31, 33; 89, 153 *n.*, 191.

Defining clauses, 116, 117. And *see* Relative clauses.

Dennison Manufacturing Co., 62 *n.*

Dexter, "Lord" Timothy, 64, 65.

Dickens, Charles, on proof-readers, 35, 36; peculiar use of colon by, 76, 77; and comma between subject and predicate, 108.

Dictionary of National Biography, 36.

Different from, or *different to*, 275.

Different than, 275.

Directly, 276.

D'Israeli, Isaac, 24.

Division of words. *See* Syllabification.

Do, as substitute for other verbs, 276.

Doubt that, or *doubt whether*, 277–79.
Due to, 279, 280.
Dunsany, Lord, 224.

Each, used with singular verb, 248; in apposition with plural subject, 249.
Either, used with singular verb, 248.
Either . . . or. *See* Correlatives.
ELLIPSIS POINTS, restricted use of, in "Atlantic," 68, 69, 70.
Emerson, R. W., on proofreaders, 32; and comma between subject and verb, 105, 108, 109; spelling of, 190 and *n.*; 6, 138, 243, 254, 260 *n.*
Encyclopædia Britannica, 24.
En-Dash, 125.
"English spellings," 192–95.
Enumerations. *See* Series.
Errors, inevitability of, 20, 21.
Etc., &c., 165, 166.
Every, used with singular verb, 248; not used alone except as modifier, 249.
Everyone, 206 and *n.*
Evidence, as verb, 266.
EXCLAMATION MARK, with true exclamations, 146 *n.*, 147; without exclamatory words, 148; interpolated, in brackets, 148, 149; with other points, 149; position of "quotes" with reference to, 149.

Far, 281.
Farther, 280–82.
Fellow, combinations of, with other nouns, not hyphenated, 205.
Final reader, duties of, 30, 38, 39.
First reader, duties of, 26, 27; and the type-setting machine, 27, 28 and *n.*, 29.
Forever, 206.
Forward, 195.
Fowler, H. W. and F. G., *The King's English*, quoted or referred to, 4–6, 13, 14, 55 *n.*, 57–59, 61, 70, 71, 74, 84, 85 *n.*, 86, 90, 91, 105, 106, 108, 112 and *n.*, 113, 120, 121, 130, 132, 133 and *n.*, 137, 138, 143 *n.*, 146 *n.*, 147, 149, 151 *n.*, 160, 161 and *n.*, 210, 211, 212, 216, 217, 224, 230 and *n.*, 237, 243, 244, 253, 256 *n.*, 258, 261 *n.*, 262, 265, 267 and *n.*, 272, 275 *n.*, 278, 289, 290, 291 *n.*, 294.
Further. *See Farther*.

Garrison, Wendell P., "A Dissolving View of Punctuation," quoted or referred to, 8, 52, 53, 64, 65, 72, 78, 79, 88, 106, 148 *n.*, 150 *n.*
Gender, double or doubtful, of singular personal antecedent. *See* Pronouns.
Glimpse, as verb, 266.
Goldsmith, Oliver, 24.
Government Printing Office, 189 *n.*

H, Hu, form of indefinite article before words beginning with, 269.
Hajji Baba, Adventures of (translation), 156 *n.*
Hanging participle, 264, 265.
Hart, Horace, *Rules for Compositors and Readers*, etc., quoted or referred to, 8, 44, 45 *n.*, 53, 65, 67 *n.*, 73, 153 *n.*, 181 *n.*, 197, 198, 199, 204, 205.
Hawthorne, N., *The Scarlet Letter*, 87, 235; spelling of, 190 and *n.*
He, him, his, and antecedents of double gender, 253.

He or she, his or her (French *soi, son*), 253.
Howells, W. D., 191.
Huxley, T. H., 113, 157, 272.
HYPHEN, 140, 141. And *see* Compound Words.

Indefinite article, before *h* and *u*, 269.
Indirect question, question mark not properly used with, 151.
Infinitive, split. *See* Split infinitive.
International Dictionary. *See* Webster's Dictionary.
ITALICS, foreign words and phrases set in, 179–81; distinction between anglicized and foreign words, 182; used for emphasis, 182–85; prefixes sometimes set in, 203.

James, Henry, and the comma, 95, 96, 144; and the dash, 144; 281.
James, William, 85, 192.
Johnson, Samuel, 24, 212.
Johnston, Sir W., *The Man who did the Right Thing*, 69 *n.*
"Jumping comparison," the, 14, 15.

Key-board operators, 25, 26.
King's English, The. See Fowler, H. W. and F. G.

Landor, W. S., 147.
Lay, 282.
Learned languages, Cobbett on, 10, 11.
Leinstein, Madame de, *Punctuation in Verse*, 59, 60, 79, 124, 132.
Lie, 282.
Like, wrong use of, for *as*, 283.
Loan, as verb, 266.

-ly, adjectives ending in, used as adverbs, 269, 270; adverbs ending in, not to be connected by hyphens with words they modify, 205; should not modify other adverbs with same ending, 270.

Making-up, 30, 38.
Meantime, meanwhile, 283.
Meredith, George, *Diana of the Crossways*, 6, 7, 83; his treatment of quotations and quasi-quotations, 156, 157, 218 *n.*
Mister, 164 and *n.*
Mistress, 164 *n.*
Moore, Annie C., 59.
More, P. E., 136.
Morley, Viscount, 246.
Murray, Sir James A. H., 44, 197, 198.

Neither, or not the proper correlative of, 241; used with singular verb, 248.
Neither . . . nor. See Correlatives.
New English Dictionary, 197, 276, 282.
No, not, properly followed by *or* or *nor?* 234–36.
Non-defining clauses, 116, 117. And *see* Relative clauses.
Nor, after *no, not*, etc., 234–36; after *neither*, 234 *n.*
Not only . . . but also. See Correlatives.
Noun, omission of, 256; verb used as, 266.
Nouns, compound, use of hyphen in, 205, 206.

O, oh, 284.
Object, comma between verb and, 109, 110.
Off, wrong use of, for *from*, 284.
On, and *upon*, 284–86.

One (impersonal), 286, 287.
Only, often misplaced, 287–89.
Onto, 286.
Or, after *no*, *not*, etc., 234–36; improperly used as correlative of *neither*, 241.
Orthography. *See* Spelling.

Paragraphing, 19.
PARENTHESES (curves), sometimes preferable to commas, 111; commas, when used with, 122, 123; when preferable to dashes, 137, 143; special uses of, 141, 142; to enclose parenthetical matter, 142–44.
Parenthetical clauses, set off by commas, 99, 100, 110–13; by dashes, 133 *ff.*, 142, 144; by parentheses, 142–44.
Participial clauses, use of comma with, 102.
Participle, hanging. *See* Hanging participle.
People, singular or plural? 246.
PERIOD, the, uses of, 65; position of, with reference to other points, 67 and *n.*
Periodic arrangement of sentences, 57 *ff.*
Prefixes, how treated in combinations, 202, 203.
Prepositions equivalent to *and*, effect of, on number of verb, 250, 251.
Pronouns, number of, 252–54; and antecedents of double, or doubtful, gender, 253; omission of, 257. And *see* Relative pronouns.
Pronunciation, and syllabification, 42, 45.
Proof-readers, fallibility of, 21; first employment of, 24; divers opinions of, as a class, 30–32, 33, 35; attitude of authors toward, 31–33; characteristics of, generally, 33, 34, 36. And *see* Copy-holder, Final reader, First reader, Queries.
Proof-reading, history of, 23–26; effect on, of introduction of type-setting machines, 25 *ff.*
Proofs, galley, 26 *ff.*; page, 30 *ff.*; plate, 39.
PUNCTUATION, divers views on, 52 *ff.*; main purpose of, to assist the reader, 54, 55; theory of treatment of, in Atlantic usage, 55, 56, 63; and "periodic arrangement," 57 *ff.*; author's wishes, how far consulted, 61–63; "open" and "close" systems of, 89.

Quasi-quotations, use of "quotes" with, 155–58.
Queries, by proof-readers, 30 *ff.*; proper subjects of, 34 *ff.*
QUESTION MARK, uses of, 150; interpolated, in brackets, 151 and *n.*, repetition of, 152; improper with indirect question, 152; position of, with reference to "quotes," 152.
QUOTATION MARKS ("quotes"), single, use of, in *Atlantic*, 3, 153; position of, with reference to other points, in Atlantic usage, 67, 78, 88, 149, 152, 154, and in English usage, 154 *n*; use of, with other than direct quotations, 154–59; unnecessary, 160, 161.
Quotations from foreign languages, 18, 19.

Relative clauses, defining and non-defining, distinction be-

tween, 113, 114, 219, 220; comma and, 114, 115; *that* and *which* in defining, 218–25.
Relative pronoun, omission of, when justifiable, 225–27; examples of curious use of, 227, 228.
Riverside Press, "modified Webster" spelling used at, 186 *ff.*; *Handbook of Style* issued by, 200.
Roman numerals, omission of period after, 56, 57, 66.
Rumford Press, 40.
Ruskin, John, *Sesame and Lilies*, 6, 7, 64, 114, 122, 124, 132; his erratic punctuation, 64, 83, 84, 105, 124, 139, 236, 254, 260.

Sala, G. A., 65.
Scudder, Horace E., on punctuation, 54.
Sedgwick, Anne Douglas, 80.
SEMICOLON, confusion in rules for use of, 78, 79; and dash, 87, 88; position of, with reference to quotes, 88. And *see* Comma.
Sense, as verb, 266.
Sentence, "complete," 65 and *n.*, 66.
Series, semicolons in, 81, 86, 87; commas in, 92–96.
Shall and *will*, 289–92.
Shaw, G. Bernard, 161.
Sheridan, R. B., 65.
Should and *would*, 289–92.
Someone, 206 and *n.*
"Spaces," rules for use of, 49, 50.
Spacing, even, its bearing on division of words, 41, 45; difficulty of securing, 50, 51 and *n.*; punctuation and, 63.
Spectator, The, 210.
SPELLING, in Atlantic usage, 186 *ff.*; forms not preferred by Webster, 187, 188; divers views on, 190–92; words ending in *l*, *p*, *r*, *t*, etc., 188, 189; words ending in *ise*, *ize*, 193; special words, 195, 196. And *see* English spellings.
Split infinitive, 218 *n.*, 267, 268.
Stage, as verb, 266.
Standard Dictionary, 189.
Stephen, H. L., 8, 10, 12.
Subject, comma between verb and, 104–109; verb should agree in number with, 242 *ff.*
Subjunctive forms, 268.
Summey, George, Jr., *Modern Punctuation*, quoted or referred to, 7, 8, 53, 54, 63, 68, 69, 73, 74, 113 *n.*, 132, 134, 135, 140, 141, 142, 201 and *n.*, 203 *n.*
SYLLABIFICATION, generally, 3; confusion of "authorities" concerning, 41–45; various "systems" of, 42, 43, 45; Atlantic rules for, 45 *ff.*; abnormal, cases of, 47 *n.*

Than, properly a conjunction, 271, 272.
Than whom, 211–13.
That (conjunction), use of comma with, 112; omission of, when justifiable, 258–61; repetition of, 262; use of, with "doubt," 277–79.
That (relative pronoun), when used with personal antecedent, 207; with collective nouns, 208; with mixed antecedent, 209; in general, 216, 217; not used in non-defining clauses, 217, 218; choice between, and *which*, in defining clauses, 218–25.

Their, theirs, them, they, not to be used referring to singular antecedents, 252, 253, or to *one*, 286.
Till, 196.
To-day, to-morrow, to-night, 203 and *n.*, 204 *n.*
Toward, 195, 196.
Transpire, 294.
Tree, in combinations, not hyphenated, 205.
Try and for *try to*, 295.
Two-em Dash, 125–27.
Tyndall, John, 157.
Type-setting machines, effect of introduction of, in proof-reading, 25, 26.

U, indefinite article before certain words beginning with, 269.
University of Chicago Press, *Handbook of Style*, 42, 43, 81, 117 *n.*, 168, 180, 181, 199, 200, 204, 205.
Until, 196.

Verb, and subject, comma between, 104–109; and object, comma between, 109, 110; should agree in number with subject, 242 *ff.*; number of, with collective nouns, 244–48; with *each*, etc., 248, 249; omission of, when justifiable, 255, 256; noun used as, 266.
Webster, Noah, "his improved spellings a precious heritage," 190, 191; other views, 191, 192.
Webster's Dictionary, orthography of, and Atlantic usage, 186 *ff.*
Wells, H. G., 68.
Were (subjunctive), 268.
Whether, use of, with "doubt," 278, 279.
Which, not used with personal antecedent, 217; with collective nouns, when, 208; in non-defining clauses, 217; choice between *that* and, in defining clauses, 218–25. And *see And which, Than whom.*
While, misuse of, 295, 296.
Whitaker's Almanac, 30.
Who, whom, with personal antecedent, 207; in defining clauses, 207, 208; with collective nouns, 208; with animate creatures other than man, 209. And *see Than whom.*
Whoever, whomever, whosoever, whomsoever, 228, 229.
Whom, improperly used for *who*, 210, 211.
Will. See *Shall.*
Woolley, E. C., *Handbook of Composition*, quoted, 132, 151 *n.*
Worcester's Dictionary, 189
Would. See *Should.*

Z00
15
215